

tained against Russia be abandoned; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5058. Also, petition of Press Service Co., 25 West Forty-third Street, New York City, N. Y., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 3390 (H. R. 10329); to the Committee on Appropriations.

5059. Also, petition of Mrs. J. A. Trimmer, 1265 West King Street, Decatur, Ill., urging passage of Elkins bill (S. 4596) for Spanish War veterans, their widows, and dependents; to the Committee on Pensions.

5060. Also, petition of Charles D. Center, secretary Chamber of Commerce, Quincy, Ill., urging passage of Federal road appropriations; to the Committee on Roads.

5061. Also, petition of J. D. Hollingshead Co., 205 South De Salle Street, Thebes, Ill., by Paul L. Dysart, jr., urging 1-cent letter postage on drop letters; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

5062. Also, petition of Francis T. Simmons & Co., importing glove merchants, 320 South Franklin Street, Chicago, Ill., urging a sales tax to take the place of the present system of taxation on business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5063. Also, petition of J. S. Madden, secretary and treasurer of the United States Customs Inspectors' Association, 450 Federal Building, Chicago, Ill., urging passage of House bill 15089, fixing the compensation of inspectors; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5064. Also, petition of Interstate Iron & Steel Co., 104 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill., urging passage of Senate bill 4204, relating to interference with commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5065. Also, petition of American Farm Bureau of Federation, 1411 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D. C., urging the Muscle Shoals appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5066. Also, petition of American Association of State Highway Officials, Richmond, Va., urging that Congress should extend the provisions for Federal assistance to the States, and should therefore pass House bill 14905; to the Committee on Roads.

5067. Also, petition of Herman H. Hetler Lumber Co., 2601 Elston Avenue, Chicago, Ill., urging that there is no justification for a duty on rough lumber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5068. Also, petition of Tonk Manufacturing Co., 1912 Lewis Street, Chicago, Ill., urging appropriation for continuing the work of the forest products laboratory at Madison, Wis.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5069. Also, petition of Juliet F. Goodrick, 1210 Astor Street, Chicago, Ill., protesting against the granting of water-power rights in the national parks; to the Committee on Water Power.

5070. Also, petition of Morden Frog & Crossing Works, Chicago, Ill., by Irving T. Hartz, urging that Congress direct the Treasury to honor interstate commerce certificates, thus releasing large sums, enabling railroads to pay for supplies purchased and also to resume buying; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, January 19, 1921.

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 18, 1921.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

MEMORIALS OF WYOMING LEGISLATURE.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask that the memorial of the Legislature of Wyoming, which I send to the desk, may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The memorial was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF WYOMING,
Office of the Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Wyoming, ss:

I, W. E. Chaplin, secretary of state of the State of Wyoming, do hereby certify that the annexed copy of enrolled Senate joint memorial No. 1, of the sixteenth legislature of the State of Wyoming, has been carefully compared with the original, filed in this office, and is a full, true, and correct transcript of the same and of the whole thereof.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Wyoming.

Done at Cheyenne, the capital, this 14th day of January, A. D. 1921.

W. E. CHAPLIN,
Secretary of State,
By H. M. LYMAN,
Deputy.

Enrolled joint memorial 1, Senate, sixteenth Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing Congress to enact into law the so-called "French-Capper truth in fabric bill."

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Wyoming (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized as follows:

Whereas shoddy made from rags absorbs a large part of the legitimate demand for virgin wool; and
Whereas the general public is deceived thereby at the expense of both the consumer and the producer, to the great profit of the manufacturers of shoddy goods; and
Whereas the term "all wool" has become a means of deception and fraud: Be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be urged to enact the so-called French-Capper truth in fabric bill; be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this joint memorial be sent to each of the members of the congressional delegation of this State in Congress, and to the chairmen of the committees in Congress to which this bill has been referred, with the request that they employ their best efforts to secure the speedy enactment of this measure into law.

W. W. DALEY,
President of the Senate.
L. R. EWART,
Speaker of the House.

Mr. WARREN. I ask that the joint memorial of the Legislature of Wyoming, which I sent to the desk, may lie on the table and be printed in the RECORD.

The memorial was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF WYOMING,
Office of the Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Wyoming, ss:

I, W. E. Chaplin, secretary of state of the State of Wyoming, do hereby certify that the annexed copy of enrolled house joint memorial No. 1 of the sixteenth Legislature of the State of Wyoming has been carefully compared with the original filed in this office and is a full, true, and correct transcript of the same and of the whole thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Wyoming.

Done at Cheyenne, the capital, this 14th day of January, A. D. 1921.

W. E. CHAPLIN,
Secretary of State,
By H. M. LYMAN,
Deputy.

Enrolled joint memorial 1, House of Representatives, sixteenth Legislature of the State of Wyoming.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Wyoming (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized as follows:

Whereas the producers of live stock, wool, and farm products are today facing almost certain financial ruin, owing to the demoralization of the markets for their products, coupled with the unprecedented high cost of production of those products; and
Whereas this condition has been brought about largely by the dumping upon our markets of cheaply produced foreign products; and
Whereas this influx of foreign products has been greatly accentuated by the rates of foreign exchange, which, in effect, have placed a bonus upon such importations; and
Whereas the continued production of live stock, wool, and farm products is so seriously threatened by these conditions that an emergency exists that is without parallel in the history of this country: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be earnestly urged to enact without delay the so-called Fordney emergency tariff bill now pending; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be urged to provide that in the collection of customs duties the customs authorities shall be directed to compute such duties upon the basis of the normal rate of exchange; be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this joint memorial be sent to each of the members of the congressional delegation of this State in Congress, to the chairmen of the committees in Congress to which these measures have been referred, and to the President of the United States, with the urgent request that they employ their best efforts to secure the immediate enactment of these measures into law.

W. W. DALEY,
President of the Senate.
L. R. EWART,
Speaker of the House.

Mr. WARREN. I also present on behalf of my colleague [Mr. KENDRICK] identical resolutions of the Legislature of Wyoming, and they will take the same course as those which I have presented.

REPUBLICS OF HAITI AND SANTO DOMINGO.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I ask permission to submit a resolution for reference to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The resolution (S. Res. 428) was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations be, and it is hereby, authorized to investigate all the circumstances attending the participation of Americans, either civilians or members of the Military or Naval Establishments, in the governmental affairs of the Republics of Haiti and Santo Domingo.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15130) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are no further amendments as in Committee of the Whole, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendments.

The amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. PENROSE. I move, with a view to making it the unfinished business, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15275) imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products to meet present emergencies, to provide revenue, and for other purposes. I make the motion, of course, with the understanding that the bill will be laid aside for the consideration of appropriation bills.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Glass	McCormick	Sheppard
Ball	Gooding	McCumber	Sherman
Beckham	Gronna	McKellar	Simmons
Calder	Hale	McLean	Smith, Md.
Capper	Harris	McNary	Smoot
Colt	Harrison	Moses	Spencer
Culberson	Heflin	Nelson	Sutherland
Curtis	Henderson	New	Swanson
Dial	Johnson, Calif.	Overman	Townsend
Dillingham	Jones, Wash.	Page	Trammell
Edge	Kellogg	Penrose	Underwood
Fletcher	Keyes	Phipps	Wadsworth
France	King	Pittman	Warren
Frelinghuysen	Knox	Polindexter	Williams
Gay	La Follette	Pomerene	Willis
Gerry	Lodge	Robinson	

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I was requested to announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are engaged on business of the Senate in attendance upon a meeting of the Committee on Manufactures.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-three Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, this morning I got into the Chamber two minutes late. I came straight from a meeting of the Committee in Immigration, at which we were considering the immigration bill. I had served notice in the Senate that there were three or four amendments which I desired to offer to the District of Columbia appropriation bill, two of which, I think, were pending. They were only pending and not offered, because we were trying to get through with the committee amendments first. The Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] has some amendments that he wishes to propose.

I wish to say to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] that I have no desire to delay the bill to-day. One of the amendments that I expect to offer is, in my opinion, very necessary for the welfare of the District. It is to provide some school buildings. I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed, and I hope the Senator from Kansas will not object to a reconsideration.

Mr. CURTIS. I judged from the action yesterday that Senators on the other side were simply delaying, desiring to kill all the time they could, but if the Senator from Mississippi states that he has two amendments which he desires to offer in good faith I will consent to a reconsideration.

Mr. HARRISON. There may be two or three amendments. I will say to the Senator, as to his suggestion with reference to yesterday, that I occupied the floor yesterday not over 40 minutes at most, and I discussed the community-center amendment which was before the Senate. It was a matter with reference to which there was some very sharp debate, and I can not understand why the Senator makes the suggestion.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I understood that I had a motion pending to proceed to the consideration of the so-called emergency tariff bill, but if the Senator from Mississippi states to the Senate that owing to being a few seconds late in entering the Chamber he failed to have an opportunity to address himself to the bill making appropriations for the expenses of the District of Columbia, and now moves to reconsider the vote by which that bill was passed, I feel that I owe him the courtesy of withholding my motion until his motion can be acted on.

Mr. HARRISON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PENROSE. But I wish it understood that at the earliest opportunity and at every opportunity I intend to press my motion until the emergency tariff bill becomes the unfinished business of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi? The Chair hears none. The vote whereby the bill was passed is reconsidered, the vote whereby it was passed to a third reading is reconsidered, and the bill is now in the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I called attention in a few general remarks a day or two ago to communications which I have received concerning certain features of the bill. Statements were made to me that the appropriation carried in this bill is too large and that provisions are made for entirely too many employees. Conformable to the information which has been conveyed to me, I move, on page 6, line 8, to strike out the word "four" and insert the word "two," so that it will read: "two assistant engineers at \$1,200 each."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 6, line 8, where the bill reads "four assistant engineers at \$1,200 each," it is proposed to strike out the word "four" and insert in lieu thereof the word "two."

Mr. CURTIS. If the Senator from Utah will turn over to the subcommittee or to the conferees on the part of the Senate the letter which he has in reference to these employees and others, I will have no objection, so far as I am personally concerned, to consenting to the amendment, in order that we may take it to conference. I wish to add, however, that the committee went very carefully into all these estimates for places and only allowed such as the District Commissioners made a showing that they needed; in fact, we did not give them nearly as many as they estimated for.

Mr. KING. Let me say to the Senator that I read the testimony, and while not desiring to criticize the District Commissioners, I will say very frankly that their testimony was not convincing or impressive. They seem to be guided by the same spirit and actuated by the same desire as other departmental heads who appeal to Congress for appropriations. There was not, as I read their statements, that apparent spirit of cooperation, that earnest desire for economy, which should manifest itself in the requests for appropriations, particularly at this time when the people are groaning beneath the burdens of taxation. The Senator knows that the estimates which have been transmitted by the heads of departments and by bureau chiefs have exceeded what Congress has thus far indicated it will allow not by millions, but by hundreds of millions of dollars; indeed, as I recall, at the last session the estimates of the various departments exceeded by more than \$1,000,000,000, the amount which was finally appropriated by Congress. It has become a part of the established practice of the executive departments of the Government to swell the estimates which they transmit to Congress as the basis for appropriations to the extent of millions and hundreds of millions of dollars. One of the chief arguments in favor of the budget bill arises from the fact that the heads of the departments, the bureau chiefs, and the executive agencies of the Government seem utterly oblivious to the law and to matters of economy and problems of taxation and revenue. Their chief concern in too many instances is to secure enormous appropriations and to obtain authority to extend their authority and activities. There is but little regard for the taxpayers and no interest in conserving the Treasury.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to add that the commissioners estimated for increases in the case of 43 employees in the branch of the service referred to; but the Senate subcommittee and the full committee refused to allow the increases.

Mr. KING. That shows, Mr. President, the lack of merit upon the part of the contention of the commissioners. We have here a provision for the care of District buildings, for which a large sum is appropriated and a large number of employees are allowed by existing law; but, notwithstanding that fact and notwithstanding the fact that the Treasury faces a deficit of \$2,000,000,000, the Senator from Kansas has called attention to the action of the commissioners in asking for 43 additional employees for one small agency of the municipal government.

Mr. CURTIS. I beg pardon. I meant that the commissioners asked for increases of salary in the case of 43 employees.

Mr. KING. For how many additional employees have they asked?

Mr. CURTIS. They have asked for no additional employees, but have asked for 43 increases in salary.

Mr. KING. I understood that they desired additional employees. It appears, however, that the demand is for increased compensation for a large number of employees in this branch of the service. But let me ask the Senator from Kansas if it is not a fact that the District Commissioners have asked for a large number of additional employees in numerous departments of the District government?

Mr. CURTIS. In other parts of the bill they asked for a number of additional employees, which were refused by the Senate committee.

Mr. KING. I am glad to learn that the committee denied such request. The fact, however, is patent that the commissioners have asked for nearly or quite \$7,000,000 more than were appropriated for 1920 or 1921. It is unfortunate that there should have been displayed by the District officials such a spirit of "spending" and so little concern for the taxpayers of the District and the country. There can be no justification for such demands in the face of the financial depression now existing and the bankrupt condition of the United States Treasury. As proof of the fact that appropriations for the District have been generous, if not extravagant, during the war period and since let me invite attention to the appropriations which have been made for a number of years. And notwithstanding these large appropriations the officials of the District supply estimates and make demands for millions more. It would be well for business men and taxpayers to more often be named for Commissioners of the District.

In 1881 the appropriations for the District were \$3,425,000 plus, and in 1882 they were \$3,379,000 plus. In the same year the appropriations for the entire expenses of the Government amounted to but \$332,791,000 and to \$361,000,000 plus for 1882.

In 1883 Congress appropriated for the District \$3,496,000, and in 1884 \$3,505,000 plus. The entire expenses of the Government in the last-named year were only \$349,000,000 plus.

In 1885 the appropriations for the District were \$3,594,000, and in 1886 \$3,622,000. I am omitting the odd figures. The grand total of the expenses of the Government for 1885 was \$396,000,000, and for 1886 \$344,000,000.

In 1887 there were appropriated for District purposes \$3,721,000, and for 1888 \$4,284,000, while the expenses of the Government for the last-named year were only \$365,000,000.

We appropriated for the District in 1889 the sum of \$5,056,000, and in 1890 \$5,682,000, while in the last-named year the entire expenses of the Government were only \$395,000,000.

In 1891 there were appropriated for District purposes \$5,762,000; in 1892 there were appropriated \$5,597,000, while the entire expenses of the Government for 1891 were only \$463,000,000.

In 1893 the District appropriations aggregated \$5,317,000; in 1894 they amounted to \$5,413,000, while the expenses of the General Government for the same year were only \$519,000,000.

In 1895 Congress appropriated \$5,444,000 for the District, and in 1896 \$5,745,000, while in the last-named year the expenses of the Government were only \$496,000,000.

In 1897 the sum of \$5,900,000 was appropriated for District purposes; the next year there were appropriated for District purposes \$6,186,000, while the Government expenses for the last-named year totaled but \$528,000,000.

In 1899 there was an appropriation of \$6,426,000 for the District, and in 1900 an appropriation of \$6,834,000. The expenses of the Government for the last-named year were \$698,000,000.

In 1901 the appropriations for the District were \$7,577,000; in 1902 they were \$8,502,000, while the expenses of the Government rose until they totaled \$730,000,000.

In the Fifty-seventh Congress, in 1903, \$8,544,000 were appropriated for District purposes, and in 1904 \$8,638,000. For the last-named year the expenses of the Government were \$752,000,000.

In 1905 \$11,000,000 were appropriated for District purposes, and in 1906 \$9,801,000. Evidently Congress perceived that some retrenchment was necessary, and in 1906 they reduced the appropriations for the District by considerably more than \$1,000,000. The entire appropriations for the Government in 1906 were \$818,000,000.

In 1907 the District received \$10,232,000, and in 1908 \$10,440,000, while the expenses of the Government reached the high mark of \$919,000,000.

In 1909 there were appropriated for District purposes \$10,000,000, and in 1910 \$10,699,000. In each of those years, 1909 and 1910, the expenses of the Government exceeded \$1,000,000,000. Senators will recall the resentment manifested throughout the United States when Congress appropriated a billion dollars for one year's expenses of the Government. There was much criticism of the "billion-dollar Congress." Economists and serious students of the administration of the General Government dem-

onstrated that there was waste and extravagance upon the part of the officials of the United States and that reforms were imperative. It is to be regretted that the people do not insist most earnestly on economy in all governmental affairs. They are often roused by the bold raids upon the Treasury, and the realization that they are being plundered by recreant officials, but after the tempest of their wrath has passed they slumber and the raids are repeated.

In 1911 the District received \$10,608,000, and in 1912 \$12,000,000, while the expenses of the Government continued to be over a billion dollars, the exact amount for 1912 being \$1,022,759,948.52.

In 1913 the District of Columbia received \$10,675,000, and in 1914 \$11,383,000, while the total expenses of the Government were \$1,098,000,000 for the last-named year.

Mr. President, in 1917 there were appropriated \$12,841,000 for the District, and in 1918, when we were at war, when there ought to have been economy practiced in all branches of the Government, \$14,172,000 were given the District. The total expenses of the Government for that year, including the stupendous sums appropriated for war purposes, amounted to \$18,892,000,000.

In 1919 there was appropriated for the District \$15,000,000, and in 1920 \$15,364,000.

Mr. President, I doubt whether we can defend the large appropriations for 1919 and 1920, in view of the condition of the Treasury and the heavy burdens placed upon the backs of the taxpayers of the United States. Instead of retrenchment in the departments of the Government, there were increased expenditures—I was about to remark that there were increased extravagances. The era of profligate expenditures had not ended. Thrift and economy were not virtues possessed or followed by individuals or by the Federal Government. Speculation was rife and prudent counsels were ignored. We are now reaping some of the harvests of those evil days, and the full payment for our follies has not yet been made. Then in 1920-21 we were presumed to be getting back to prewar conditions and seeking to readjust the economic conditions of our country, but we increased the appropriations for the District over those of the preceding year, which were \$15,000,000, to \$18,373,000. For that year the expenses of the Government totaled \$4,780,000,000.

Now, for the fiscal year 1922 the House has increased the District appropriation for 1921 by more than \$1,000,000. For the fiscal year 1921, as stated, the appropriation for District purposes was \$18,373,000. As the District bill for 1922 came from the House it carried items which aggregate \$19,807,012.90. As I understand the report submitted by the Senate Committee on Appropriations on the pending bill, there is a net decrease reported amounting to \$66,349.13. So that, reading from the report of the committee, the "amount of the bill proper as reported to the Senate is \$19,740,663.86." The committee report contains this language:

Increase recommended by Senate committee for emergency items to be paid one-half from the surplus revenues of the District of Columbia, \$2,276,500.

So that the amount of the bill as reported to the Senate is \$22,017,163.86.

The report also contains this language:

Amount of estimates for 1922, regular and supplemental, \$25,039,044.99.

And the committee states that—

The bill as reported to the Senate is less than the regular and supplemental estimates for 1922, \$3,021,881.13.

Mr. President, the figures which I have just read show the tremendous increase in appropriations for the District of Columbia. We are now asked to appropriate for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, more than \$22,000,000 for the District, whereas a few years ago the appropriations were four, five, six, and seven millions of dollars.

I appreciate the heavy responsibility which rests upon the majority party in Congress. They are expected to control legislation and determine national policies. They will be held accountable for the extravagance in the Government and the mistakes in administration. For bad laws and bad government the Republican Party will be responsible.

The burden rests upon the majority to adopt a plan which will save the Nation from heavier taxation and bond issues. Indeed, it is the imperative duty of the Republican Party to reduce expenses and tax burdens. Our friends have had control of the legislative branch of the Government for nearly two years, and should have reduced taxes and effectuated reforms in the departments. There will be no solving of the financial situation unless there is manifested upon the part of the majority of the Senate and the House a spirit of retrenchment

and economy not thus far exhibited in the bills which have been reported. The Democrats desire to aid the party in power in lightening the burdens of the people and in reducing the expenses of the Government. We now appeal to our friends upon the other side of the Chamber to join with us in working out reforms and reducing the appropriations for the coming year.

Mr. President, this is not a partisan matter. I am not now charging that the Republicans are more extravagant than were the minority. As a matter of fact, I have perhaps offended Democrats by my criticism of the conduct of some alleged Democrats who have held positions of responsibility under Mr. Wilson.

They have not been provident and economical, and their mistakes are reacting upon the entire party. I am anxious that we shall relieve the people of the United States of the pressing burdens of taxation resting upon them. I should like to see the excess-profits tax modified materially, if not repealed, and the revenue laws so modified that the needs of the Nation could be met without effort or strain by the people; but I ask Senators how this is going to be done if we continue to make these enormous appropriations, the evidence of which is found in the bill now under consideration. If we increase appropriations, it is manifest that we can not decrease taxes, and the amount of taxes now derived by the Government is inadequate to meet the expenses of the Government. Therefore, there must be retrenchment and reform and a reduction in the expenses of all executive branches of the Government; and it rests upon the Appropriations Committee, difficult though the task may be, to cut down these expenses and to report bills that will carry in the aggregate for the next fiscal year not to exceed \$3,000,000,000. If the Appropriation Committees fail to enforce economies, where may we look for guidance and safety?

But this bill is larger than any measure ever reported for the District. In this hour of depression and financial darkness the committee reports a bill carrying more than \$4,000,000 in excess of the appropriation for 1918.

I was interested in the statement submitted a few days ago of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. He lifted his voice against the saturnalia of extravagance now found in the Government, and warned the country of the peril threatening the financial integrity of the United States. He called attention to the fact that there would be a deficit of more than two billions of dollars for the current year. How are we to meet that deficit? As we are now proceeding and appropriating money the deficit will be augmented instead of reduced.

There will be more than \$2,000,000,000 of deficit; yet, Mr. President, I believe that every day Senators receive numerous communications complaining of the high taxes and praying for relief from the burdens, so onerous and heavy, which press down upon them. I appeal to the Republican side of the Chamber in the interest of economy. I feel sanguine that this side of the Chamber will join with them in cutting these expenses to the lowest possible limit, to the end that the deficit which is inevitable may be reduced to the smallest possible proportions and the Nation relieved from the necessity of issuing bonds in time of peace to meet the ordinary expenses of the Government.

A few years ago, under a Democratic administration, it was charged that bonds were issued in time of peace. It is true that the issue was small; but we shall be compelled, unless taxes are increased, to issue bonds to the extent of more than \$2,000,000,000. If we do not issue bonds, we shall be compelled to issue temporary obligations of the Government in order to raise funds to meet the daily expenses of the Government.

In my opinion, Mr. President, this bill should be reduced at least \$2,000,000,000; and after I shall have tendered a number of amendments I shall offer a motion to recommit the bill—I shall not debate it, but shall ask for an immediate vote—to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions to report it back with a reduction of at least \$2,000,000.

I see no reason, in view of the conditions of the country and in view of the conditions of the Treasury, why we should increase this year the appropriations for the District.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator realizes that for the years during the war the appropriations for the District of Columbia were very, very greatly reduced. Many improvements that they needed were not given them for that reason. I desire to state, in behalf of the Senate committee, that notwithstanding the thorough investigation made a year ago by the House, when the bill came to the Senate your Senate committee reduced the appropriations—the first time a House appropriation bill had

ever been reduced by the Senate—and in this bill, so far as the principal bill is concerned, we again reduced it; and the separate section was put in as a matter for the consideration of the Senate, in order to use for necessary purposes the surplus that is now in the Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I think my friend the Senator from Kansas is slightly in error, and yet I always bow to him in a discussion of matters that come from the Appropriations Committee. As I understood the Senator, he stated that during the war the appropriations were greatly reduced.

Mr. CURTIS. No; I did not mean that. What I meant was that we refused to give them the estimates for real and necessary improvements. Why, the streets of this city were neglected until, as the Senator knows if he went over them in automobiles, they were in a disgraceful condition.

Repairs were delayed; the usual amount was not appropriated because of the war and war prices, and the streets got in such condition that last year and this year something had to be done. There were no new school buildings erected. Last year we had to authorize the erection of a lot of school buildings, and this year we are providing for the completion of those buildings that were authorized a year ago.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I have heretofore called attention to the appropriations for preceding years; but in view of the statement made by the Senator, permit me to recur to the appropriations made for a few years last past.

In 1913 the appropriation for all District purposes was \$10,679,000. In 1914 it was \$11,383,000. We are asked now to more than double the appropriations that were made for District purposes in 1913 and 1914. In 1915 the appropriations, as I have heretofore stated, were \$12,000,000; and in 1916, before we entered the war, the appropriations for District purposes were only \$11,589,000. I believe that in 1913, 1914, 1915, and 1916 the appropriations for District purposes were not only adequate but extremely liberal, and they permitted extensive municipal improvements.

In 1917, the year we entered the war, the appropriations were \$12,841,000, and in 1918 we appropriated \$14,172,000. In 1919, as I have stated, we increased that amount by nearly \$1,000,000, and in 1920 we increased the appropriation over 1919 by approximately \$300,000, the aggregate being \$15,364,000. In 1921 we jumped from that figure to \$18,373,000.

Mr. President, there has been no niggardly policy pursued by Congress toward the District. There was no reduction of appropriations because of war activities.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the Senator insists on misconstruing what I said. I said we refused to give the estimates of the District Commissioners, for this reason: If you will take the estimates and the appropriations, you will find that the amount they asked for was not appropriated.

Mr. KING. I apologize if I misinterpreted the position of my friend. I certainly did not desire to do so, and I meant merely to state that the Government, notwithstanding we were at war, did not reduce the appropriations below the peace years, but, upon the contrary, increased them.

The Senator said that appropriations were not made to the limit recommended or estimated for by the District Commissioners. I concede that. Mr. President, my friend knows that his party has denounced in unmeasured terms the action of the executive bureaus and departments in making estimates which were so entirely disproportionate to the amounts actually needed or the benefits which would result to the Government from the appropriations sought; and I am not saying this by way of criticism. I approve of their attitude in that respect. It is absolutely impossible, as Republican Senators and Representatives have repeatedly said—and I approve of their statements—to curb the avariciousness of the executive departments. If we appropriate a million, the heads of the departments and the executive agencies of the Government immediately demand a million and a half, and if we grant the demand they are not satisfied until they get two million.

There is no satisfying the desires of the executive agencies of the Government for appropriations from the Treasury of the United States, and those agencies are as deaf to the pleadings of the people for relief from the burdens of taxation as the inanimate objects around us. They have no more concern, apparently, for the condition of the Public Treasury than if they lived on the island of Yap, or in Tahiti.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, will the Senator repeat that geographic expression?

Mr. KING. I welcome my distinguished friend to our midst again, and I am sure that in his journey overseas he has learned much more of geography than I know. Mr. President, I stated that some of the executive departments which were making

these great demands for appropriations seem to have no more concern for the condition of the Treasury of the United States than if they were inhabitants of the island of Guam, or Yap, or lived at Tahiti.

Mr. President, it is unfortunate that there should not be more of a spirit of cooperation upon the part of the executive officials of the Government with Congress, more of a purpose to understand the condition of the Treasury, and to make their estimates with reference to the burdens which rest upon the people. Instead of that, I repeat, nearly every Government agency, if not all executive departments of the Government, make demands for appropriations greatly in excess of their needs and greatly in excess of what the condition of the Treasury would warrant.

Mr. President, I can not understand the apathy which exists in the country to-day upon the part of men in public life when we mention the fact that we are confronted with a deficit of \$2,000,000,000. Before the hysterical condition which the war developed existed the thought of a deficit of two or three hundred million dollars would have provoked deep concern; indeed, it would have aroused profound resentment in every part of the United States. Yet Senators talk about a deficit of \$2,000,000,000 as if it were an unimportant matter. When they mention it and inquiries are directed to the means by which that deficit shall be met there is silence which bespeaks unconcern. The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENNELL] is with us this morning, and he announced a moment ago that a bill which has just been reported from the Finance Committee is to be pressed for consideration. We are, of course, delighted that the distinguished Senator, the chairman of the Committee on Finance, is with us discharging his duties as a Senator in the able manner which has always characterized his activities in this body. But, Mr. President, will that bill, if it shall be enacted into law, increase the revenues of the United States? Manifestly not. Concede, for the sake of the argument, that the emergency tariff bill which is now before us, shortly to be considered, should supply some revenue, it is obvious that the amount to be derived from it will be inconsequential. If I interpret the emergency tariff bill aright, its purpose is to cut off imports rather than to raise revenue to meet the expenses of the Government.

Mr. President, are we to adopt new theories of political economy? Some of our statesmen and public writers are now announcing to the world that we can be a great exporting nation and yet not be an importing nation; that we can have prosperity by being a selling nation, and a selling nation exclusively. It might be wise, Mr. President, to declare by formal resolution or enactment that the United States of America is to continue to be a rich and powerful nation by selling to all peoples of the world and refusing to buy from any of the peoples of the world, and that all who purchase from the United States must pay for their commodities and products obtained with gold.

Mr. President, to recur to the question before us, the appropriations made for 1919 and 1920, \$15,000,000 each year, are now to be increased by approximately \$7,000,000. Cities everywhere in the United States are crying out for retrenchment, reform, reduction of expenses. I noticed the other day that in the city of New York it was announced that the Republican governor intended to effectuate financial reforms, and attention was called to the fact that there were more than 10,000 offices, created quite recently, which were deemed unnecessary.

As soon as Gov. Miller announced his policy of reform, the politicians, the officeholders, the great army of employees of the State, their friends, and all whom they could influence, began to besiege the executive mansion and to direct all influences at their command against the governor and against the policy of reform which he advocated. May I be permitted to say to my Republican friends who may have their lightning rods up for the Presidency four years or eight years from now, that they must keep their eyes upon Gov. Miller, of New York. If he carries out his policies of reform, his State and other States will demand that he be the standard bearer of the Republican Party.

What reason is there, Mr. President, for increasing the appropriation for the District from \$15,000,000, as it was in 1919 and 1920, to \$21,000,000 or \$22,000,000 now, in this period of depression, when we are attempting everywhere to economize and to get back, in the language of the President elect, to normalcy? Certainly we want to get back to a condition of sanity in public expenditures. We want to reach a condition where we can accept it as a fact that the money which we spend has to be wrung from the earnings of the people. As the Senator from Mississippi said in his eloquent speech day before yesterday, whenever a dollar drops into the till of the Treasury we know that that dollar has been taken from the pockets of the wage earners and of those who toil and labor in our land.

I see no reason, Mr. President, for this great increase to \$22,000,000 for the current year. It is too much to appropriate for the District. The condition of the Treasury forbids it, and the condition of the District not only does not demand but does not warrant or justify this amount.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope that there may be stricken from this bill a number of items, to which I shall call attention. I wish the Senate would recommit the bill for the purpose of having the committee go through it again, and prune it, and reduce it at least \$2,000,000; and even then, Mr. President, it would exceed the appropriations for 1920 by four or five million dollars, and the appropriations for 1921 by the same amount.

Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Kansas whether he will resist the amendment which I suggested a moment ago?

Mr. CURTIS. I stated to the Senator that if he would turn over to me the letter he has from one of the officials of the city, as I understood it, giving information that these clerks are not necessary, I would accept the amendment, so far as I could personally, and would take it to conference. But I want the letter the Senator showed me yesterday, so that I may have something to submit to the conferees. I think the matter is entitled to an investigation. I am sorry it was not brought to the attention of the subcommittee while we were in session. If it had been, we would have looked into it very carefully.

Mr. KING. I stated to the Senator that I would gladly give him a copy of the letter, and I will hand him the original whenever he desires. The letter does not specify the particular clerks in any of these departments who should be separated from the service.

Before I conclude I wish to call attention to a letter which I have received from a gentleman who is thoroughly familiar with conditions in the District. It is insisted that in the assessor's office the number of clerks is entirely too great. The writer refers to the fact that there are five field men carried at \$2,000 each per annum who are unnecessary.

Mr. CURTIS. We went very thoroughly into the question, and we find that they asked for an additional number of field men because they had over 41,000 personal property lists or statements to look into, and they claimed that they needed more inspectors because of conditions which were created by the law of two years ago placing a tax on intangible property.

Mr. KING. May I ask the Senator if the amendments which I am about to tender, most of which are in conformity with information which I have received, are not offered by me, and the conference committee is advised of the criticisms made and are convinced that there ought to be reductions, would they have the authority to make them?

Mr. CURTIS. No; under the rule we can not change the bill as it passes the House and the Senate. There would be nothing in conference.

I may add that in one place we reduced the number of employees from three to two because we found after investigation that they had more in that branch than were really needed. The committee went into the matter very carefully, particularly that part having to do with the assessor's office.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator consent to do this? I do not wish to delay or take up time and yet I feel constrained to offer a number of amendments. Will the Senator permit me to offer these amendments and have them adopted pro forma, with the understanding that if the committee, upon investigation, shall find that they ought not to be allowed, the conferees will disagree to them.

Mr. CURTIS. I will state to the Senator that so far as I am personally concerned that is satisfactory and I presume the Senate will adopt them. I am very anxious to get a vote on the bill.

Mr. KING. I shall run through a few of the amendments very hurriedly. I will state to the Senate that I have had no opportunity to go into the departments and make the investigations necessary to enable me to determine whether or not the reductions should be made. I am acting upon information which has been conveyed to me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah, on page 6, line 8, to strike out "four" and insert "two."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. On page 7, line 15, under the subheading "Personal tax board," I move to strike out the words "2 clerks at \$1,200 each."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. I suggest to the Senator from Kansas that amendments should be made in the totals, changing them to the correct amounts.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask unanimous consent that the clerks at the desk be directed to change the totals to correspond with the amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KING. On page 7, line 18, under the subheading "License bureau," I move to strike out "two" where it reads "2 at \$1,400 each," and insert in lieu thereof the word "one" and to strike out the word "each," so that it will read, "clerks—1 at \$1,400," and so forth.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. On page 7, line 20, under the subhead "License bureau," I move to strike out the words "assistant inspector of licenses, \$1,000."

Mr. CURTIS. Does the Senator wish to retain the inspector of licenses at \$1,200 or the assistant inspector of licenses at \$1,000?

Mr. KING. My proposed amendment is to strike out "assistant inspector of licenses, \$1,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. Under the subheading "License bureau," on page 7, in line 21, I move to strike out the words "temporary clerk hire, \$1,500."

Mr. CURTIS. I know from an investigation that that would be a very serious mistake, because they do need temporary employees in the rush period. The committee made a thorough investigation in that particular, because there was an effort made to get additional help. I hope the Senator will not insist upon that amendment.

Mr. KING. Not having adequate information to warrant me in contending for it, and in view of the statement of the Senator that investigation has been made, I withdraw the amendment.

I move, on page 7, line 25, under the subheading "Collector's office," to strike out the word "two" and insert in lieu thereof the word "one"; to strike out the word "cashiers" and insert the word "cashier"; and to strike out the word "each," so that it will read, "one assistant cashier, at \$1,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. For information I desire to inquire of the Senator having the bill in charge whether, under the provisions of the bill providing for street-cleaning division superintendents, there has been appointed a person bearing the title of superintendent of city refuse?

Mr. CURTIS. Not in the bill and not to the knowledge of the members of the subcommittee. Some one may have given that designation to some person employed in that branch of the service.

Mr. KING. I am advised that out of the lump sum that is appropriated \$4,000 is paid to an individual who bears the title superintendent of city refuse; that the work which he is presumed to do ought to be done by the street-cleaning division; and that the supervision of that work should be conducted by the superintendent of the street-cleaning division; in other words, that a new office is created, not by statute but out of a lump-sum appropriation. I have looked through the bill, I will say to the Senator, and I do not find any provision making an appropriation for a superintendent of city refuse, but my information is that such a position exists and that it exists by authority of some District agency.

Mr. CURTIS. If that is true, it must be paid out of the \$8,000 mentioned on page 12, in line 16, under the subheading "Surveyor's office," appropriated for services of temporary draftsmen, computers, laborers, and so forth. If the Senator desires to move to reduce that amount to \$4,000, the conference committee can inquire into the matter to which he has referred.

Mr. KING. Accepting the suggestion of the Senator, which, I think, is better than my own idea, I move to amend as follows: On page 12, under the subtitle "Surveyor's office," in line 16, strike out the figures "\$8,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$4,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. I now ask the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee to another matter. Criticism has been directed and communications have been made to me with respect to the item of asphalt and cement inspection, \$2,400.

Mr. CURTIS. On what page?

Mr. KING. On page 9, in line 17, under the subtitle "Engineer commissioner's office," the item reading "assistant inspector, \$1,500." May I inquire of the Senator whether those items were investigated? I observed that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DIAZ] the other day, speaking with reference to some features of the bill, called attention to the failure of this department to make proper inspections.

Mr. CURTIS. We made a very careful investigation of the items in that section. I think they should stand as they are unless some further information is secured.

Mr. KING. I have heard criticism of a number of items in the provisions of the bill under the head of "Engineer com-

missioner's office." In order that the conferees may investigate the subject a little more fully, I shall offer several amendments.

On page 9, in line 17, I move to strike out the words "assistant inspector, \$1,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. May I make one further inquiry of the Senator? Some of the good people of the District have called upon me with respect to some of these matters, and I feel it my duty to call the attention of the committee to them. I have been asked why the District should not assume control over all the parks in the District, why there should be a divided responsibility, and not only a divided responsibility of these matters of which the District takes cognizance but a division between the District and the War Department.

Mr. CURTIS. I will state to the Senator that the subcommittee has had just about as much trouble with that question as has the Senator from Utah. We have had it up at every session of Congress for the last four or five years, not only in regard to parks, but bridges. We have tried to remedy it two or three times and the matter has gone into conference. The conferees, because of the attitude of the departments, have been unable to agree to the Senate amendments and the Senate has usually receded, because it has been carried that way for so many years. It is true that the parks are under the War Department and under the Commissioners of the District. As one member of the committee, I think they ought all to be under the jurisdiction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Mr. KING. I think the Senator is right. I agree with him.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the bridges should be treated likewise, but I believe that can be better worked out later on when we shall have more time than at this session. We have also made an effort to take the bridges out of the jurisdiction of the department and put them in the hands of the District Commissioners.

Mr. KING. I am reluctant to halt the consideration of the bill by a prolonged discussion of the matter or by offering further amendments, but I do sincerely hope that the Senator will take some steps to remove what I conceive to be a most glaring evil. If it is not done, I shall introduce a bill within the next few days transferring all bridges and parks and the entire park and street system in every particular to the District Commissioners. And I shall also provide that there shall be a consolidation of all agencies of the District that have to do with the parks and grounds and trees upon the streets.

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask the Senator from Kansas whether the parks are now under the jurisdiction of the War Department?

Mr. CURTIS. Not all of them. Some of the parks are under the jurisdiction of that department. I think they have jurisdiction over Rock Creek Park and perhaps one or two others. The little parks around through the District are under the jurisdiction of the District Commissioners, but some of the older parks are under the War Department.

Mr. HARRISON. The small parks in the city proper are under the jurisdiction of the District Commissioners?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes; all of them.

Mr. HARRISON. So there is no divided authority there?

Mr. CURTIS. No.

Mr. HARRISON. It may be that Rock Creek Park was placed under the jurisdiction of the War Department because they have a military road, or a great many roads, there that they have to maintain.

Mr. KING. I am not sure that I understood the Senator from Kansas. Do I understand that all the little parks and grounds are under the jurisdiction of the District Commissioners?

Mr. CURTIS. All the little parks, unless there might be some facing on the river, about which the committee has no information, which would be under the jurisdiction of the Engineer Division of the War Department. Those, if there are any such, and Rock Creek Park are the only ones I know of. All the other little parks throughout the city are under the jurisdiction of the District Commissioners.

Mr. KING. I have been advised, Mr. President, that that is not correct.

Mr. CURTIS. I am carrying this matter in my head; it has been some little time since my attention was directed to it, and I do not remember all the details with reference to it. We had the question as to the bridges and the parks under consideration, I remember, upon three different occasions, and we did settle the bridge question at the time, but we paid no attention at this session to the park question.

Mr. KING. Criticism has been made, let me say to the Senator, of the policy under which there are a number of heads with respect to the little parks and plots that are under the

jurisdiction of the city. For instance, there is one department which has merely to do with certain trees upon the streets. Then there is another division which looks after flower plots and grasslands. Instead of having the entire parking system and the streets, so far as the trees are concerned, under one head, an examination of the District regulations and of the ordinances and statutes will reveal that there are a number of heads, a number of divisions; that the responsibility is divided. There is no one person to whom we may go who has complete authority as the head of a department or of a bureau over all of the parks and grounds and trees within the District.

Complaints have been made that in the engineer commissioner's office there are unnecessary employees. I regret that I have not had time to make a personal investigation, so that I might submit amendments covering the matter.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the Senator from Utah give me the date of the letter which he has?

Mr. KING. It is dated January 4.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish simply to state that the committee was in session but received no such communication. It is a little strange that the gentleman who desired to make such a complaint would not send it to the committee, as we were then considering the bill, instead of sending it to a Senator not a member of the committee.

Mr. KING. I will state to the Senator that this is only one of a number of complaints which I have received in reference to the matter. There have been a number of individuals who reported to me the situation in many of the departments of the District, and they have alleged that there was inefficiency and needless employees.

If we are to retrench, there should be a reduction in the number of employees in the District, and a material diminution of appropriations for improvements and other matters covered by the bill.

May I ask the Senator from Kansas what disposition was made of the item of \$5,000 in lines 12, 13, and 14 on page 11?

Mr. CURTIS. That appropriation was reduced from \$12,500 to \$5,000. The District Commissioners asked for more than \$12,500—my recollection is, they asked for \$15,000—but the committee, after carefully investigating the matter and remembering for what purposes the money was to be used, thought \$5,000 was sufficient.

Mr. KING. I regret that the committee did not report to strike it all out. I wish to move to strike the provision out; and, if it be necessary to enable me to do that, I will move to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment in line 14 was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. If the Senator desires to move to strike out the entire provision, I do not think it necessary to move to reconsider.

Mr. KING. Very well. I move to strike out lines 12, 13, and 14 on page 11, which is the item of \$5,000 for incidental and all other general necessary expenses.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. KING. I move to strike out the entire provision on page 12 embraced in lines 14, 15, 16, and 17.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 12 it is proposed to strike out lines 14, 15, 16, and 17 as amended, as follows:

For services of temporary draftsmen, computers, laborers, additional field party when required, purchase of supplies, care or hire of teams, \$4,000, all expenditures hereunder to be made only on the written authority of the commissioners.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator will remember that on his motion an amendment was made to that provision. I hope he will let the provision remain. Surely some money is needed, and I think the appropriation of \$4,000 should remain.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator from Kansas, from the investigation made, believe that the appropriation is required?

Mr. CURTIS. We are satisfied that the surveyor's office needs some money for the purpose indicated in the paragraph. Whether the entire sum of \$8,000 is needed we could not say, but we thought they did need some money. They asked for more.

Mr. KING. In the light of the Senator's statement I withdraw the amendment.

I desire to inquire of the Senator as to the items under the head of "Free Public Library, including Takoma Park Branch," whether his investigation confirms the view that all the expenses provided for are necessary? On yesterday I was told by a gentleman that some of those items are unnecessary. I have no knowledge in reference to the matter myself.

Mr. CURTIS. We made a very thorough investigation of the subject, and if the Senator from Utah will examine the matter

he will find that we reduced in one place the number of employees from three to two. We made an increase, on page 14, for extra services on Sundays, holidays, and Saturday half-day holidays because of the showing that was made. Really they have asked for a very great increase in the item. We gave the matter very careful consideration, and it was also very carefully considered in the other House. We believe that they need all that we propose to give them at this time, if not more.

Mr. KING. While the question is not germane to the matter under consideration, I should like to inquire of the Senator if he is familiar with the item which relates to the sale of some land owned by the District and used in connection with the Mott School?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, there is an old school building there which has not been occupied for school purposes for years. Business has encroached generally upon the neighborhood where that building is located, and there are probably not a sufficient number of children in the locality to justify the erection of a new school building there. The commissioners asked the committee to authorize the sale of the building and to allow them to purchase another site.

The committee thought the safer plan to pursue was to authorize the sale of the building—and it can be sold now probably for more than can be obtained for it later on—and let the money go into the Treasury, and then let the Congress determine when a new site shall be purchased, where it shall be located, and how much the new building shall cost.

Mr. KING. A lady of the city who has given a great deal of attention to schools and to charitable work—a very estimable lady, so far as I know—this morning called my attention to that item, and stated that the land is needed for playground purposes. She stated that it would be a mistake to sell the property; but that a certain business—I do not care to name it, although I have the name here—has been for a long time anxious to obtain the ground. Without giving further the reasons assigned, she states that the sale of the property would be very improper.

Mr. CURTIS. Business adjoins the property on all sides, but I will state to the Senator that if he desires to move to strike it out I have no objection. I repeat, the building is not being used and has not been used for years either for playgrounds or for school purposes.

Mr. KING. I shall move to strike it out, but I say to the Senator now that I have no knowledge other than that communicated to me, and I shall be satisfied if the conferees will investigate to determine whether it is necessary, or in the near future may be necessary, for school purposes or for playgrounds. If so, it ought not to be sold, but if not it ought to be sold.

Mr. CURTIS. This is the second time the subject has been before the committee. The subcommittee went very carefully into the matter. Without getting out to look over the ground, we drove by it in an automobile and saw that business establishments are located close by. So we concluded that it would be best to sell the property and let the money be invested in some other part of the city where a new school building is needed. Certainly there is not going to be any very great need for a school building there, for business is bound to grow around it rather than private residences.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I shall yield to the judgment of the Senator. I felt that it was my duty, in view of the strong statement made to me by the lady to whom I have referred, to call the attention of the committee to this matter. If the committee feels, after the full investigation which they claim to have made, that the sale of the property is proper, I shall defer to their judgment.

Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senator to page 23, lines 6, 7, and 8, and I should like to ask whether the item of \$285,000, which is stated as the total, has been reached as a result of a consideration of the specific items. Lump-sum appropriations are always objectionable, and unless there has been a complete itemization of all of the sums which total the large sum indicated, I shall move to amend.

Mr. CURTIS. The matter was carefully investigated. All of that money will come back after a while, when payments are made by the people who have to pay the assessments. The money is merely advanced.

Mr. KING. Does the information furnished to the committee show that an itemization was made of the sums which constitute the grand total?

Mr. CURTIS. It was estimated that the amount stated will be required to meet the assessments. I repeat, the money all comes back; it is simply advanced. If it is not all used, it goes back into the Treasury; and if it is used, it is then reimbursed by those who derive benefit from its use.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator make the same explanation with respect to the item of \$575,000 appearing in line 16, page

27? Of course, it is clear that that amount will not be paid back by the contiguous property owners, but will be a direct charge upon the treasury of the District.

Mr. CURTIS. That item refers to repairs of streets and avenues. That money does not come back, but we went into the matter very carefully and found that that much at least, if not more, was needed. It is necessary for the District authorities to catch up with the street-repair work, which, as I stated a few moments ago, was neglected to a very great extent during the period of the war.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, there are a number of other items of which complaint has been made, but I have detained the Senate so long that I shall not trespass further upon its time.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 32, after line 15, it is proposed to insert the following item:

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to investigate conditions affecting the existing contract for the collection and disposal of night soil in the District of Columbia during the first two years of the five-year contract ending June 30, 1923, with a view to determining whether any adjustment should be made in connection with a reported loss of \$4,217 to the contractor, and to adjust the same if the facts disclose the necessity for such adjustment: *Provided*, That additional compensation, if any, paid as authorized herein shall not exceed the sum of \$5,000 for the two years, which sum, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated.

Mr. CURTIS. I make the point of order that that is not estimated for, and that it is a claim.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Those are two good reasons for sustaining the point of order.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, on page 37, at line 20, I desire to offer an amendment changing the word "two" to "three."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 37, line 20, under the heading of "Public schools," where it reads "two assistant superintendents," it is proposed to strike out "two" and in lieu thereof to insert "three."

Mr. HARRISON. And on line 21, after the word "superintendents," insert "one of whom shall be business manager."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I make the point of order that that is not estimated for.

Mr. HARRISON. I understood that it was estimated for.

Mr. CURTIS. There is an item estimated for an assistant superintendent, who shall be business manager.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. If the Senator offers it in that way, of course it is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. HARRISON. That is the way it has been offered—"an assistant superintendent, who shall be business manager."

Mr. CURTIS. I shall have to object to that amendment and hope it will be defeated. Your committee carefully considered the matter and does not think a business manager is needed here in the schools.

Mr. HARRISON. I had hoped the Senator would withhold his judgment until I could present this matter, unless it was fully presented before the committee.

Mr. CURTIS. I may say that it was fully presented before the committee, and also the question of these various assistant superintendents; and your committee, after a very thorough investigation, thought it ought not to be considered at this time.

Mr. HARRISON. Was it on account of the cost involved?

Mr. CURTIS. Not on account of the cost, but because of the number of employees. There are some 13 supervising principals that we thought perhaps ought to be done away with, and that the work could be done by one or two men. If I am on the committee next year, the question will be taken up of reducing those supervising principals from 13 to 1 or 2, and transferring some of the work that is now done by them to this business manager, or whoever he may be; but we did not feel justified, upon the showing that was made, in making at this time a change in regard to the 13 supervising principals. Therefore the committee—not only the subcommittee, but the full committee—was opposed to providing for a business manager.

Mr. HARRISON. Did the subcommittee believe that it would necessitate an addition of 13 employees, or a change of 13 employees?

Mr. CURTIS. No; we think we have a number more than we need now doing certain work. These supervising principals are supposed to go around to the different schools and look after the property and look after the schools. The subcommittee, after carefully going into the matter, were of the opinion that they were not needed, and that when the change was made the

question of considering a business manager could be taken up; but we did not feel that we had at this time the information that would justify amending that provision, and reducing them to three or four or five, and providing for a business manager or some such other officer. We thought the matter ought to be given further consideration.

Mr. HARRISON. The question of whether or not we should have supervising principals in the various districts of the city is a different question altogether from the question of whether or not we should have a third assistant superintendent of the school system who shall be a business manager. They are distinct officers and perform different functions. I do not agree with the Senator that we should abolish the supervising principals, because they are merely principals over a certain number of schools, as a matter of fact, and are the heads of the schools in those particular districts, and do this supervising work. They make their reports to the assistant superintendents—in the case of the white schools to the white assistant superintendent, and in the case of the colored schools to the colored assistant superintendent—and they, in turn, make their reports to the superintendent. But I say that the question presented by the Senator is different, and has nothing to do with a business manager.

Mr. CURTIS. That is true; but I stated that we wanted to settle the entire question at one time, and did not feel that we could go into the question of readjusting the school service in this bill at this short session of Congress.

Mr. HARRISON. I have offered the amendment with a view of trying to help the committee, in a spirit of economy. I think it would be a matter of economy. The amendment that I have proposed—and it is offered in absolutely good faith, I will say to the Senator—will only involve an additional expense of \$3,750. We have, as the Senator is thoroughly aware, a superintendent of schools; then there are two assistant superintendents, very valuable assistant superintendents—one especially valuable, Mr. Kramer. The other one I can not say so much for; but one is over the white schools and the other is over the colored schools. This third assistant would not interfere with the work of the assistant superintendent over the white schools nor with the work of the assistant superintendent over the colored schools, but would perform a function that is now being performed by the superintendent, and which so burdens his time and occupies his attention that it is very liable to detract from his ability to perform other duties that he should perform. In other words, this third assistant superintendent should get the same salary as the assistant superintendent over the white schools or the assistant superintendent over the colored schools, but should be the business manager and should handle all the business details incident to the school system of the District of Columbia.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, to save time, I will, so far as I am concerned, accept the amendment and take it to conference, where we will have time to give it further consideration.

Mr. HARRISON. I thank the Senator very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of Washington in the chair). The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, there are some amendments that we discussed some days ago; I think the first one is on page 48, in line 7. It is touching the salaries of janitors.

Mr. CURTIS. Seventy-one janitors.

Mr. HARRISON. The amendment proposes to change the salary of \$720 to \$820.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator—and I am doing this without consulting my colleagues—that the subcommittee thought that some increases ought to be made in these smaller salaries. If the Senator will limit his amendment to the 71 janitors, and make the increase \$60, which will give them \$780 a year and \$240 bonus besides, I should be inclined to accept his amendment, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. HARRISON. Now, if the Senator will notice, right under that, on page 48, lines 8, 9, and 10, there are four janitors, all of whose time is taken up. They are the janitors of smaller buildings, and they get only \$600 each. I think the subcommittee were under the impression that they really had increased those salaries, but they have overlooked the \$600 positions. We ought to give them a little increase, I think.

Mr. CURTIS. Well, make that \$660.

Mr. HARRISON. I move, then, on line 10, page 48, that the "\$600" be changed to "\$660"; and on line 7, page 48, I move to change the "\$720" to "\$780."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendments offered by the Senator from Mississippi.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, as one interested in the schools of the District, I desire to commend the committee for the special consideration they have given to the subject of providing further for the development of the school system, especially the provision made for purchasing new school sites, and also for the consideration which the committee have given to the matter of providing new buildings. I think there is one very serious defect in the bill, to which I am sure the committee gave considerable attention, and that is the matter of the salary of the superintendent of schools.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I do.

Mr. CURTIS. We looked into that matter very carefully. Both the subcommittee and the full committee felt that this year it was unwise to increase the salaries of any of these officers who were drawing over \$2,000, and I shall have to oppose any amendment that may be offered to increase the salaries. The new superintendent is a new man here, and perhaps with some changes that we can make in the revenues next year we shall be in better condition to consider the question of increasing some of the salaries.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Is it a fact that the superintendent accepted his position with the understanding that his salary would be increased shortly?

Mr. CURTIS. I can not speak in regard to that; but surely the commissioners, or whoever employed him, would not be justified in making such a contract, because we have for the last three years, since the war was on, refused every year to increase the salary of the superintendent. The question has been up, and if that promise was made it was with full knowledge of the fact that the Congress had been refusing to do anything of the kind.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The reason given by the board of education during the hearings before the committee investigating the school conditions in the District of Columbia for their unwillingness to change the superintendent was the fact that the salary was so small and inadequate that a suitable man could not be obtained for the sum paid here, \$6,000. I know the unanimous opinion of the investigating committee was that the salary was very inadequate; that there ought to be a substantial increase in order to get a man who would meet the requirements of this important public office. Did the subcommittee consider especially the subject of the superintendent's salary?

Mr. CURTIS. The subcommittee considered not only the salary of the superintendent but those of the assistant superintendents. We considered it very carefully.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The subcommittee is satisfied there is not any danger of losing, because of inadequacy of salary, the services of the new superintendent?

Mr. CURTIS. We thought not. The fact that he was a new man also was considered, and if by the end of the year he displays extraordinary ability, or good ability, and shows that he is entitled to an increase, probably the committee next year will consider the question of increasing his salary.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. In any event, the committee did not feel disposed to recommend an increase at the present time, after considering the subject fully?

Mr. CURTIS. No; not at this time.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator from Kansas about a matter which has been called to my attention in connection with the revenue and inspection branch of the water department.

Mr. CURTIS. The items for the water department begin on page 95 of the print before the Senate.

Mr. KENYON. It is with reference to an increase in the pay of the men employed in that service. Was that question brought before the committee?

Mr. CURTIS. The District Commissioners asked for increases in the salaries of 38 employees, but the subcommittee did not feel that it could recommend them. The subcommittee very carefully considered the question of increases in salaries. We thought that we would be justified in recommending an increase of \$120 in the salaries of men who were getting \$600, and when we finally reported the matter to the full committee we recommended an increase for certain laborers and one or two janitors from \$600 to \$720.

This morning we have also consented to an increase in the salaries of janitors who were getting \$720, so that they will receive \$780. We thought this was a very bad time to go into a general increase of salaries. We feel that that matter ought to be delayed until the classification bill is presented, at which time the whole question should be settled. If I had my way

about it, I would begin at the beginning of this bill and write new salaries all the way through, making some reductions and some increases.

Mr. KENYON. When this matter was presented to me it seemed that these men were not receiving anything like a living wage, and they informed me that for the year ending June 30, 1921, about \$962,000 was collected above what has heretofore been collected for water rent.

Mr. CURTIS. The first increase they asked was where the man was getting \$2,400; and surely he can live on that. They wanted it increased to \$3,000. The next was a clerk who was getting \$1,500, where they wanted the salary increased to \$1,800. Clerks are ordinarily paid only from \$1,200 to \$1,400.

Mr. KENYON. I do not see much to complain about there.

Mr. CURTIS. For a clerk drawing \$1,200 they wanted the salary increased to \$1,500. Then for three clerks drawing \$1,000 they wanted an increase to \$1,200; for one index clerk drawing \$1,400 they wanted an increase to \$1,600; for eight meter computers, now drawing \$1,000, with the \$240 bonus, making \$1,240, they wanted an increase to \$1,200; for one meter clerk drawing \$1,200 they wanted an increase to \$1,500; for two meter inspectors, from \$1,000 to \$1,200, and one messenger from \$600 to \$840. We are paying messengers in the Government service \$600.

Mr. KENYON. The per diem men were the ones called to my attention.

Mr. CURTIS. The per diem men are paid out of a lump sum, and the commissioners fix that themselves.

Mr. KENYON. They could allow an increase out of the lump sum?

Mr. CURTIS. Certainly they could.

Mr. KENYON. I do not complain, because I know the Senator has given this measure careful consideration; but I would like to see the wages and salaries of people who do not have a living wage raised at least to a living-wage point.

Mr. CURTIS. Your subcommittee fully agrees with the attitude of the Senator from Iowa; and their salaries should be raised not only to a living wage but to a point where the men working for the Government could lay a little aside for a rainy day, if they ever have any.

Mr. KENYON. But a living wage should be the minimum, at least.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, we have now gotten down to the last amendment I have to offer, an amendment in which I am very much interested and which we discussed at some length Saturday, the amendment touching the immediate construction of some school buildings in the District. I have never offered the amendment. I think I signified my intention of offering it, but I have changed it since the first suggestion was made. I will say to the Senator from Kansas and to the Senate that this will remove every objection which has been made to the construction immediately of some school buildings here.

The original estimate for a building at Taylor Street and Fourteenth Street was \$500,000. In my original suggestion I cut the limit of cost to \$400,000. The amendment I propose now will cut it further and make it \$375,000, which will place it at about 32 cents a cubic foot, which is a price lower than any bid which has been made in any city in the United States for the construction of school buildings or public buildings. I shall, before I finish, read the telegrams which have been received in response to the telegram sent out from the District Commissioners to various cities of the country, asking them the price per cubic foot for the construction of school buildings in those cities. The lowest price that was asked in any city of the country was in Denver, 33½ cents a cubic foot. One of the reasons suggested by the subcommittee for not taking action for the immediate construction of school buildings here was because of the suggestion that at Denver, Colo., they have been constructing some school buildings at such a low cost. The figures which came from Denver are the only ones lower than the last bid for the erection of a school building in the District of Columbia. The last bid that came for the construction of a school building here was 39 cents a cubic foot. In Denver it was 33½ cents a cubic foot.

There is a great deal of difference between the school buildings that were constructed in Denver at 33½ cents a cubic foot and the one for which the bid was made in the District of Columbia at 39 cents. A telegram I will read shows that the building in Denver has wooden floors, for instance. Of course, the bottom floors of the schools here are cement. I have reduced the limit of cost so that it will be less than 33 cents a cubic foot, giving to the District Commissioners the right to reject any and all bids. If they see fit to reject a bid of 28 cents a cubic foot, they have the power to do so, under my amendment. But they can not go over the limit of cost, which would be around 32

cents a cubic foot, less than the cost of any building in the country.

So, I say further to the Senator from Kansas, I have reduced this \$500,000 estimate for the building at Fourteenth and Taylor Streets to \$375,000.

For the building which was estimated to cost \$500,000, to be erected in the vicinity of the Gage, Emery, and Eckington Schools, I have cut the estimate from \$500,000 to \$375,000. No one can say that the contractors of the District of Columbia can gouge the people by too high prices, when you make the limit of cost on that building \$375,000, reducing it from the original estimate of \$500,000.

For the building of the 16-room schoolhouse north of and in the vicinity of Lincoln Park, for which the commissioners estimated \$400,000 as the limit of cost, I have reduced the estimate to \$300,000, in order to remove the objection which has been raised here against the immediate construction of these school buildings, which everybody admits are needed and needed badly. Nobody has raised his voice in objecting to the immediate construction of them, except for the limit of cost, which we will remove by these amendments.

For the building of the 8-room building adjoining the Buchanan School, which the commissioners estimated would cost \$200,000, I have reduced the estimate to \$150,000, so that no contractor, if he desires to gouge the people of the District of Columbia, and is trying to extract from them an unreasonable cost, can do it, because the limit of cost will prevent him from doing it.

Mr. CURTIS. An 8-room building in Denver was erected for \$85,000.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; a building in Denver. Down in my country we have some beautiful little brick buildings, county educational schools, and public schools, which do not cost over fifteen or twenty thousand dollars. If you look at them from the outside, they appear to be beautiful; they look as well as buildings in this city. But they are not equipped with the same heating apparatus; their floors are not like those in the buildings here; their finishings are not like the finishing of the buildings here. There may be one layer of brick, while the schoolhouses here may have three or four layers of brick. You can not tell anything from the looks of a building, so far as the workmanship and the material that is placed in it are concerned. The best way to make a comparison of cost is to compare the cost per cubic foot.

There was a telegram sent out by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia on January 11, at the suggestion of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 11, 1921.

Will you please telegraph—collect—the cubic-foot cost or classroom cost of your school buildings, as shown by the latest proposals? Also state whether buildings are of fireproof construction or other materials. Information needed for use before Appropriations Committee.

A very full telegram asking for that information.

The telegram received from Denver was as follows:

DENVER, COLO., January 11, 1921.

Teller School, 445,000 cubic feet, cost, less architect's fee, \$150,254; 12 classrooms; 33½ cents per cubic foot.

The last bid received for the erection of a building in the District of Columbia was 39 cents a cubic foot. That building was with cement floors and the very finest of heating apparatus inside, and well ventilated. The telegram further says:

Building of brick, with fireproof corridors, halls, and stairs; maple floors in classrooms on wooden joists, with metal lath ceilings and composition roof.

Let me go further and read telegrams from some of the other cities and see whether or not this great species of graft and corruption is existing here and existing nowhere else. I do not know whether graft exists here that has been intimated upon the part of contractors. I would not charge it and I would not state it, but I say when we look at bids that have come in here they look to be fairly reasonable when compared with bids that have been filed for the construction of school buildings in other cities. From Philadelphia, Pa., is an answer to the telegram sent to that city:

Latest proposal for school here was March, 1920. Price per cubic foot, 50 cents.

Fifty cents per cubic foot! The last bid that came in for Washington school buildings was 39 cents a cubic foot.

Here is a telegram from Buffalo, N. Y.—and I shall read all the answers to the telegram sent out from Washington. I have given Denver first place, which is 33½ cents per cubic foot. From Buffalo, N. Y., came this telegram in answer to the District Commissioners' telegram:

Bids opened June 5, 1920. Three school buildings averaged 59½ cents per cubic foot, which the school board rejected. Bids on 12 buildings will be opened January 19.

There is Buffalo, where the lowest bid was 59½ cents per cubic foot. In the city of Washington it was 39 cents per cubic foot, and yet it is said that the erection of school buildings should be put off for another 12 months or to some future date, simply because bids are too high and the contractors are extracting too much money from the taxpayers.

From Newark, N. J.:

Latest data on fireproof school building costs amount to about 55 cents per cubic foot.

That is at Newark. Here in Washington the last bid was 39 cents a cubic foot, practically 16 cents lower in Washington than it was in Newark, and yet they say, when everybody agrees that school buildings should be erected here, that we ought to put it off again, thinking that the bids are too high.

From St. Louis, Mo., is a telegram dated January 11:

Cost per cubic foot, 40 cents—Waterloo, Iowa, Fort Dodge, Iowa, and Dallas, Tex. Mr. Itner returns to city to-morrow.

At Waterloo, Iowa, Fort Dodge, Iowa, and at Dallas, Tex., the bid was 40 cents a cubic foot, and yet here in the city of Washington it was less than that, the last bid being 39 cents per cubic foot.

Boston, Mass.; we will see how they are bidding up there.

BOSTON, MASS., January 11, 1921.

Peabody (Mass.) High School, \$500,000; second-class construction, 50 cents a cubic foot.

Second-class construction, and it costs in Boston 50 cents a cubic foot, and here in the District the bid was only 39 cents a cubic foot. The telegram from Boston goes on further:

Stratford (Conn.) Elementary School, \$270,000; second-class construction, 51 cents a cubic foot.

So there you are, in Stratford, Conn., 51 cents, higher than Boston by 1 cent, and higher than the city of Washington by 12 cents a cubic foot. Yet the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS] says we have some pictures here that look mighty good for school buildings, and, although everybody says we need the school buildings, and, although 7,000 children are unable to get their schooling because we have not the buildings, they say, "Let us put it off here, because the bids are too high to build the school buildings at this time."

From Chicago, Ill., we have a telegram, which refers to several places over the country. At Bay City, Mich., in February, 1920, the bid was 53½ cents per cubic foot, 14½ cents higher than the last bid that was filed to build a school building in the District of Columbia. At Lorain, Ohio—and the new Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] has spoken in that place, no doubt, many, many times, and he knows about the schooling there—Lorain, Ohio, 43½ cents per cubic foot. That is not so high; it is getting a little cheaper now—43½ cents—and yet it is 4½ cents higher than the last bid filed to build a school building in the District of Columbia; and yet the Subcommittee on Appropriations says that we can not build them here, although the school children need them, and we need to take care of 7,000 school children, because the bids are too high.

Here are some other places. Here is Hammond, Ind.—June, 60 cents, going up 21 cents higher in Hammond, Ind., than in the District of Columbia to construct the school buildings. It begins to look to me like 39 cents was a pretty reasonable price that the contractors put in here as a bid.

At Niles, Mich.—I do not know what size place Niles is. I never heard of it before.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. It is a place of good size.

Mr. HARRISON. Niles, Mich., in July, 50 cents a cubic foot. Evidently my good friend the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] did not see these outrageous prices that had been paid in other cities, or he would not have cooperated with the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from Colorado in asking a delay in the building of school buildings in the District of Columbia. Richmond, Ind., in December, 1920, 40 cents, 1 cent higher than the last bid put in in the District of Columbia, and I think the last bid was put in here somewhere the latter part of last year.

So I submit to the Senate that there is no justification, there is not the slightest excuse if we agree that the buildings should be erected, for putting them off until we bring in another appropriation bill. The question that should confront the Senate is whether or not the buildings are needed. If they are needed, then the children of the District of Columbia are entitled to school buildings just as much as the school children of any other city in the country, and while we should protect the taxpayers, and do, to the limit, and every bid that is too high should be thrown out, yet I submit that if it does cost a good deal to build school buildings in the District of Columbia, and we can not get them built in any other way, that they should be built even for high prices, because the children must be educated.

The facts show here that we are operating a double-shift system to such an extent in the District that children get only

about a half day's schooling when they should get a whole day's schooling. I wish to read a clipping that I took from yesterday's paper, I think it was, containing this remarkable statement:

Fix for crowding in high schools—Two-shift system applied in two and continued in others.

I do not know whether all the Senators have read this, but I hope that they will accept the amendment. If the amount is not low enough, let us make it lower, but the thing to do is to get started in the erection of school buildings. I hope, if the Senator from Kansas has not read this article—

Mr. CURTIS. I have read it. The Senator can read it if he wishes or have it printed in the Record.

Mr. HARRISON. I did not know the Senator had read it.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes; I have read it.

Mr. HARRISON. Then there is less excuse to put off the building of the school buildings. Let me read it to the Senate. There are some Senators here who may not have read it:

Plans designed to provide accommodations in the already overcrowded high schools for new students expected to enroll at beginning of second semester, February 1—

That is right here at hand—

has tentatively been completed, it was announced to-day by school authorities. They call for the introduction of the 2-shift system in the only two institutions where this novel scheme of relieving congestion was not adopted in September, and the extension of this plan in the schools where it has been in operation for a half a year. Consequently, the entire white high-school system will be run on the 2-shift plan.

In the only two schools in which the plan has not been tried of relieving the congestion and preventing a child from getting a full day's schooling, but to give him only half a day, the plan is to be inaugurated on the 1st of February; and, yet, when we see such facts as these staring us in the face we say, let us put off the immediate construction of the buildings to some future day.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of Washington in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. HARRISON. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. If I understand the matter, the Senator from Mississippi and the subcommittee representing the Senate Committee on Appropriations are agreed that there is need of erecting immediately new school buildings. I understand further that the District Committee is in favor of building the necessary new buildings in the District of Columbia. I understand that the subcommittee have taken no action to appropriate the money at this time because of high building prices, and that the Senator from Mississippi desires to see the first step taken in the erection of new buildings, namely, some act passed at this session appropriating the necessary money.

If the only reason and objection is that at the present time it is too expensive to build school buildings, could not the subcommittee agree to the appropriation of the money on condition that the erection of the school buildings be deferred until such time as the District Commissioners and the Senate committee agree to the actual time in the future when the buildings may be built at reasonable cost?

I would like to ask the Senator from Mississippi if the whole matter could not be settled with the appropriation of the money, leaving the month and the exact time of building to be determined by the District Commissioners, with the approval of a committee on behalf of the Senate? That may be in three months or six months, but it will leave open for action the immediate period of time when prices drop and buildings can be built at a more reasonable price. I understand the Senator's position to be that he wants some action taken now to meet a condition that may arise in a month or two or three months, when there may be such a drop in building prices that building can commence without delay.

Mr. HARRISON. It will take three months to get the plans and specifications.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The Senator feels that to postpone the appropriation for another year may mean two or more years' delay, because it may be the period of time when we are actually discussing appropriations that building prices may be at the highest.

Mr. HARRISON. Absolutely now is the time to give relief and to get this work done at a moderate price.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. May I ask the Senator from Kansas if some arrangement can not be made to remedy the present deplorable situation? The difference between the position of the Senator from Mississippi and the committee is very narrow; it is merely a question of time as to when the buildings shall be erected.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I stated my position fully on this question yesterday. As chairman of the subcommittee I do not propose that I shall work on a committee with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the school board to arrange for school buildings. I am required now to work until 12 o'clock every night, and think I have about all the duties I can now perform.

I think the only businesslike way to proceed is to make no appropriation at this time and let the builders here come down in their prices and submit reasonable bids. When they submit reasonable and proper bids, then will be time enough for us to make appropriations. The Senator has offered an amendment providing for the erection of an 8-room building at a cost of \$150,000, which can be built in Denver for \$85,000. The contractors are asking \$100,000 to erect a 4-room building here, such as has been built in Denver for \$35,000. There has been no explanation of that discrepancy. The contractors are gouging the people of the District of Columbia.

So far as school accommodations are concerned, practically all of the children are provided for in the regular buildings, in rented schools, or in portable schools. The portable buildings ought to be done away with. I agree with both Senators on that point.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I am not out of sympathy with the Senator's position about not building to-day or tomorrow or next week, but I do want to have the funds available if in three months or six months there shall be a marked break in building prices and in the cost of construction. The door, however, would be closed by failure to appropriate now.

Mr. CURTIS. Oh, no.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. We know that another District appropriation bill can not be acted upon until a year from now, and prices may in the meantime return to high levels.

Mr. CURTIS. The committee may take up a building program upon a deficiency bill at any time. That was stated the other day. There will be an extra session of Congress here by the 1st of April, I hope by the middle of March. There will be deficiency appropriation bills at this session almost up to the last day of the session; they will be coming in at the first of next session, and the matter can be taken care of at any time when the contractors demonstrate they will erect school buildings at something near reasonable prices.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The Senator from Kansas has more confidence of the result of offering amendments to deficiency appropriation bills than have I. I think if this matter is now neglected the issue is closed for a year.

Mr. HARRISON. Absolutely.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. There is no use of deceiving ourselves as to that. What position does the Senator put us in as public servants? He says we should not appropriate this money because we do not want to yield to the excessive demands and to the extortion of corrupt contractors who have combined to make prices exorbitant. Because of that assertion shall we remain silent and allow from six to seven thousand children in the District of Columbia to be without proper school facilities? In other words, as public servants shall we continue to punish six or seven thousand children by failing to provide proper school buildings and do nothing to break up the combine, to expose the corruptionists, to send them to jail, if the law so permits? I do not think we can afford to take that position. I do not think it is fair to the school children of this city. I think if contractors have combined to keep up building prices they ought to be punished. If there is not law enough to punish them, we ought to provide the law. We are the lawmaking power of the District, and if they have any improper combine we ought to know it. If they are acting illegally or improperly, some action ought to be taken. It is not a fair excuse to the parents of six or seven thousand school children in the District to say there is a building combine here that is corrupt, and therefore we will not erect another school building, we will not appropriate any more money. Therefore I think we ought to make some provision in this appropriation bill for the expenditure of a sum of money to build schools at a later day if not at the present time.

Mr. HARRISON. Of course, Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] is aware of the fact that we never know what the bids of contractors will be until there is authorization of law and the initial appropriation is made for the construction of the buildings. The only criterion we would have to go by would be the last bid which was made by them, which was 39 cents a cubic foot.

Mr. CURTIS. We have ample opportunity to ascertain what the bids will be, because we are carrying in this bill appropriations to continue the erection of buildings, and, as I recollect,

one of the commissioners stated that they are calling for bids on a three-plan proposition. We can tell when they bid on these various parts of the construction whether or not they are getting their bids down to something like a reasonable amount.

Mr. HARRISON. But under the plan suggested by the amendment of placing the limit of cost for a \$500,000 building at \$375,000 and for a \$100,000 building at \$75,000, they can not charge too much; they can not go over the limit of cost; they have got to make bids within a limit of cost or the bids will not be accepted; the construction of the building will not be begun; the contract will not be let. So it would seem to me for us to fold our hands, sit idle, and wait to ascertain, when the horse is out of the stable, what the bids will be, and, as the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] suggests to me, when the contractors might resort to legal methods, is a very unwise policy to pursue.

It seems that the committee have grown wise very quickly concerning this matter. In the past they have made authorizations to construct a building at a cost, say, of \$300,000, and then the commissioners, without letting the bids, have come back and asked for \$60,000 more or \$100,000 more, and the committee heretofore have granted the increase. Of course, they did so in order to provide the facilities for the school children. I believe that when we place a limit of cost upon the erection of a building we should make the commissioners conform to it, and not allow them to come back and ask for, say, \$60,000 more. It seems to me, Senators, that with the price of materials declining and labor costs being reduced, now is a very good time to make the initial authorization and the initial appropriation so that bids may be called for. Then if the price comes within the limit of cost, let the buildings be erected, while if they do not come within the limit of cost, of course, the bids can be rejected.

I had not finished reading the statement that appeared in yesterday afternoon's paper when the Senator from Massachusetts interrupted me—and I am glad he did so. The statement continues:

According to some recent estimates, school officials expect at least 1,100 pupils more to enter the high schools in February, and only about 250 are slated to leave, making a net gain in their enrollment of 850, starting on the 1st of February.

I do not know where it is expected to start them, because there are no places in which to put them. If a parent goes to the Henry D. Cooke School, as I know from experience, and desires to enroll his child, he can only put the child in school for a half a day, for the double shift is in force at that school, and it is now being placed in operation, as I recall, in the only other two schools in the District where it is not now in force. It seems to me that the Senate of the United States and the Congress of the United States are culpably negligent in failing to make proper appropriation for the erection of schoolhouses in the District for the education of the children here. Such a situation is bad for the Government employees; it is bad for the citizens of the District who live and raise their families here; and it is bad for Senators and Representatives who keep their families in the District of Columbia, and accordingly can not educate their children in the States or districts from which they come, for they have to comply with the conditions existing here, and give their children only a half a day's schooling, when if they were at home they could send them to school for a whole day.

The blame is on the Congress of the United States; it is on every Senator who refuses to vote for an appropriation to provide suitable means and facilities for the education of the children.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator has referred to the Henry D. Cooke School. There are 16 rooms in that school and one portable building is attached to it. Those rooms were built to accommodate 48 children each, so that the capacity of the school is 768. The last report, however, for that school shows that there were only 533 children attending, and that there is not a room filled to its capacity.

Mr. HARRISON. I do not understand that statement exactly. I know that with a committee I visited the Henry D. Cooke School, as we visited a great many other schools, and every room looked to be crowded with pupils. I know a certain citizen who sends his children to the Henry D. Cooke School, and I know that one of his children has to abide by the double-shift system and go to school in the morning about 8.30 o'clock and leave about noon, without the possibility of returning in the afternoon because of the double-shift system there in force.

The same system is used in other schools. There is no denying the fact that additional schools are needed. That need is placarded before us in the most glaring letters; the facts are before us, and no one has ever denied them.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. If it is a fact that what the Senator from Mississippi calls the double-shift system is in operation, at any particular time would the presence of pupils in the school show the full number that attend the school?

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator is correct in his implication.

Mr. CURTIS. But, Mr. President, the census of the school was not taken under the double-shift system, but was taken when they were supposed to have only one class a day in each grade.

Mr. ROBINSON. How does the Senator know that?

Mr. CURTIS. Because I have the report, which gives the total, without reference to the so-called double shift. The rooms in that school are made to accommodate 48, whereas the highest number of children in any one room is 44, and two of the rooms house only 23 children. Other rooms house 24, 25, and up to 35 children.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. CURTIS. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON. At how many schools in this city is the double shift employed?

Mr. CURTIS. I could not tell the Senator unless I ran through the list. I might be able to give the information to the Senator later.

Mr. ROBINSON. I wish the Senator, if he has the information, would find out the number of schools which are so crowded that the double shift has to be employed and the number of pupils who are required to avail themselves of the double shift in order to obtain school accommodations.

Mr. HARRISON. There is no doubt about the schools being needed, I will say to the Senator from Kansas. He so admitted the other day. I do not think there is a better friend to the school system in the whole District than is the Senator from Kansas. He has fought hard for them and has gone around and visited the schools. I merely think that in this matter his judgment is wrong. I had hoped that before we finished the bill we could get together and adopt some plan that would result in improving the conditions and would give some hope to the parents of the school children of Washington who are not permitted under the present system and conditions to receive a whole day's schooling. Let us put some provision in this bill that will at least make the people of the District think they are getting a fair deal at the hands of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON. Can the Senator from Mississippi give me the information for which I asked the Senator from Kansas a moment ago?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes. I will read from the House hearings. Mr. Kramer, the assistant superintendent of white schools, testified as follows:

Mr. KRAMER. We are placing the pupils by double-shifting our schools. We must take care of the pupils. We can not refuse a high-school pupil. He comes and we must house him, and we are double-shifting our schools to do it, but we must have the teachers to organize the classes.

Mr. DAVIS. How do you get along now?

Mr. KRAMER. We double-shift some of our schools.

Mr. DAVIS. Until new space is constructed, do you need any additional teachers?

Mr. KRAMER. Oh, yes; because the pupils are there just the same.

Mr. DAVIS. How do they get along now?

Mr. KRAMER. We are getting along now on our present enrollment by double-shifting some of our schools. Next year we shall have at least 1,000 more pupils to take care of.

Mr. DAVIS. But suppose you do not get any more school space?

Mr. KRAMER. Then we will have to double-shift the schools in order to make space.

Mr. CRAMTON. To what extent is that double-shifting carried out now?

Mr. KRAMER. That is carried out in two schools, the Western and the Eastern.

Mr. CRAMTON. How many pupils are affected by that arrangement?

Mr. KRAMER. Roughly, I should say 1,400.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield to another question?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON. What number of pupils would be accommodated by the provisions of the amendment which the Senator has offered?

Mr. HARRISON. The provisions of the amendment which I have offered will take care of the whole situation here. In that connection I will say to the Senator that he was probably in the Senate Chamber when I read the statement that on the 1st of February, at the beginning of the second semester, they are going to provide this double-shifting in two other schools in the District in order to take care of 1,200 new pupils that will be enrolled at that time.

Mr. ROBINSON. It already applies to 1,400, and it will hereafter apply to 800 more?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON. Making a total, then, of 2,200?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Now, the facts are that to reduce the classes to 40—and there are many classes in the District schools where they have 55 or 52 or 50 pupils, and the school authorities all agree that you never should put into any class over 40 pupils—to reduce the classes to 40 pupils in the classroom, according to the estimates that have been made, it will take 57 additional classrooms. In order to take care of this double shifting at present, not counting in this new arrangement that is coming on on the 1st of February, to give a full day of school to the 28 classes now on part time—there are 28 classes, 1,400 children, on the double-shift system now, 28 classes now on part time—it will take 18 additional classrooms; and yet we are here hemming and hawing and preventing the appropriation of money for a school building because somebody got a telegram from Denver, Colo., with a photograph of a school building that looked very good, and they said: "Now, let us put this matter off. We can build one like the Denver school cheaper than we can build one like we have been building here before."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the only objection to starting these buildings now is that the contractors are in a combine, and therefore the buildings will cost more than they should, why would not a simple amendment like this be sufficient to obviate that difficulty:

Any contractor bidding for the erection of school buildings in the District having an agreement, express or implied, with other contractors or contractor in reference to such bids or such buildings, shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction shall be fined in the sum of not less than \$1,000 nor more than \$5,000, and imprisoned not more than two years.

Mr. HARRISON. I am perfectly willing to accept such an amendment as that if we can get this proposition through.

Mr. McKELLAR. A provision like that, as it seems to me, if the Senator will excuse me, taken with the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi limiting the cost, would certainly be an absolute preventive of any such condition as confronts the committee. In my judgment, the fact that contractors are in a combination and are asking more than they should ask for the erection of these buildings should not deter the committee and should not deter the Senate from doing the right thing. We all know that there are several thousand children in the city that have not proper schoolhouses in which to go to school. It means a great deal to their future. It means a great deal to their parents. It means a great deal to the city in every way; and we should take enough pride in this city to prevent that condition of affairs existing in reference to the public schools of the city of Washington. Now, if an amendment is offered which fixes the limit of cost and which will imprison any contractor who is guilty of having an agreement of that kind, it seems to me it would obviate every excuse I have heard offered as to why this appropriation should not be made for the schools at this time.

I think it is imperative that action should be had at this Congress. I do not think we should delay it at all, and I hope the amendment will be adopted; and I am going to offer that amendment, unless the Senator will accept it.

Mr. HARRISON. I will cease arguing this proposition, if the Senator from Kansas, on behalf of the committee, will accept such a proposition as that on my amendment. Then we can get through with this matter very quickly and proceed to other business.

Mr. McKELLAR. May I ask the Senator from Kansas if the amendment I have offered will not obviate the trouble that is in the committee's mind? I hope it will.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the chairman of the subcommittee having charge of this bill is patiently waiting for whatever amendments may be offered, and then he will pass judgment on them.

Mr. HARRISON. I offer this amendment now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then I will offer my amendment as an amendment to it.

Mr. HARRISON. If the Senator wants to strike out one or two of these provisions, all right. I just want to get something started.

The READING CLERK. On page 55, after line 18, it is proposed to insert:

For beginning the erection of a junior high school upon a site owned by the District of Columbia north of Taylor Street and east of Fourteenth Street, \$160,000; and the commissioners are hereby authorized to enter into a contract or contracts for said building at a cost not to exceed \$375,000.

For beginning the erection of a junior high school in the vicinity of the Gage, Emery, and Eckington Schools, \$160,000; and the commissioners are hereby authorized to enter into a contract or contracts for said building at a cost not to exceed \$375,000.

For beginning the erection of a 16-room building north of and in the vicinity of Lincoln Park, \$120,000; and the commissioners are hereby authorized to enter into a contract or contracts for said building at a cost not to exceed \$300,000.

For the erection of an 8-room extensible building adjoining the Buchanan School, \$150,000.

For the construction of an 8-room addition to the S. J. Bowen School, \$150,000.

For the erection of an 8-room extensible building in the immediate vicinity of the Mott School, \$150,000.

For the erection of an 8-room addition to the John Eaton School, \$150,000.

For the erection of a 4-room building to replace the Smothers School, \$75,000.

For the erection of an 8-room addition to the Lovejoy School, \$150,000.

For the erection of a 4-room addition to the Monroe School, \$75,000.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not regularly estimated for as provided by law, and not reported from any standing committee of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator withhold his point of order for a moment until I can offer an amendment to the amendment to go in at the close of it? I should like to have it go in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas withhold his point of order?

Mr. CURTIS. I will withhold it for the purpose of permitting the amendment to be offered.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have just written it out, so I shall have to read it:

Any contractor bidding for the erection of school buildings in the District having an agreement, express or implied, with other contractors or contractor in reference to such bids or such buildings, shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction shall be fined in the sum of not less than \$1,000 nor more than \$5,000, and imprisoned not more than two years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee offer that as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do.

Mr. CURTIS. I renew my point of order against the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, with reference to an estimate, the only difference between the estimates and the amendment I have offered and the one which the commissioners presented to the House committee and to the Senate committee, which in turn had been presented to the District Commissioners by the board of education, is a reduction from the amount that they asked for. Not only did they estimate for it, but they went before the committee of the House, and I presume they went before the committee of the Senate. I could not get a copy of the hearing, but I know they talked to them. The estimates that are provided for are in the hearings here, and the commissioners have presented the arguments. They have talked to them, not only on paper but personally about the matter.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the items offered by the Senator from Mississippi have not been estimated for and sent to us through the Treasury as required by law. The law says how estimates shall be sent to the Senate—that they shall be submitted to the Secretary of the Treasury, and that the Secretary of the Treasury shall send those estimates to the House of Representatives. That was not done in this case. I will state, for the information of the Senate, that every item estimated for by the District Commissioners in regard to the schools was placed in this bill by the committee. No one of these items was estimated for in the regular way. I may state for the information of the Senator from Mississippi that the figures were submitted to the subcommittee by the District officers at the request of the chairman of the subcommittee. That was done for the purpose of seeing if we could not devise some scheme or plan whereby we could use the surplus in the Treasury.

Mr. HARRISON. Does the Senator say that the superintendent of schools did not appear with Col. Kutz, Miss Boardman, and Mr. Hendrick, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, before the House committee and ask for these things that were estimated for; and is it not true that the only difference between the amount placed in my amendment and in theirs is that mine is smaller?

Mr. CURTIS. That did not come through the Treasury Department. They came before the House with a building program that was rejected. Then the chairman of the subcommittee of the Senate asked them to submit to him figures that he might present, to see if the surplus money could be used; and those figures were given in response to that personal request, but did not come as an estimate through the department in any way.

Mr. HARRISON. Oh, well, I do not know whether they came through the Treasury or not. I think it has come to a pretty pass when the Senate of the United States invokes the technical rule simply because the Secretary of the Treasury did not have the matter pass through his hands from the commissioners to the committee, when all the commissioners appeared before both of the committees, when the representatives of the board of education appeared before both of the committees, when the needs are here, and they are urgent, and they are necessary—I say when the Senate of the United States invokes a technical rule to prevent the consideration of an amendment under such circumstances it has come to a pretty pass.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. And when it appears that the committee themselves could not make any recommendations for the construction of new school buildings because no estimates had come to them from the Treasury.

Mr. HARRISON. Certainly the Senator does not want to insist on his point of order.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the committee had a right, as the Senator from Massachusetts will see if he will study the rules, to report an item; and had it been reported from our committee, it would have been in order. I insist upon the point of order.

Mr. HARRISON. Let me further argue the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not so far as the Chair is concerned. The Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair will sustain the point of order.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I desire to ask a question. The Senator's committee has provided here numerous items touching new sites and touching various things. Did they pass through the hands of the Treasury Department?

Mr. CURTIS. Not one of them; but they came from a standing committee of the Senate, which is provided for in Rule XVI.

Mr. HARRISON. I understand the Senator had a perfect right to do it, and yet the Senator now would invoke the rule simply because the Treasury Department did not estimate for them.

I appeal from the decision of the Chair, Mr. President, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Harris	Myers	Smoot
Beckham	Harrison	Nelson	Spencer
Brandagee	Heflin	New	Stanley
Calder	Henderson	Overman	Sutherland
Capper	Hitchcock	Owen	Swanson
Colt	Johnson, Calif.	Page	Townsend
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	Phelps	Trammell
Dial	Jones, Wash.	Poincxter	Underwood
Dillingham	Kellogg	Pomerene	Wadsworth
Edge	Kenyon	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Fletcher	Keyes	Reed	Warren
Frelinghuysen	Kirby	Robinson	Williams
Gay	McCormick	Sheppard	Willis
Gerry	McCumber	Simmons	Wolcott
Glass	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.	
Gooding	McLean	Smith, Ga.	
Hale	Moses	Smith, Md.	

Mr. CURTIS. I was requested to announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] are detained on business of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I withdraw my appeal from the decision of the Chair. I have no more amendments to offer.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I offer the following motion to recommit the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read.

The READING CLERK. Mr. HARRISON moves to recommit House bill 15130 to the Committee on the District of Columbia with

instructions to report the bill forthwith to the Senate with the following provisions added thereto:

For beginning the erection of a junior high school upon a site owned by the District of Columbia north of Taylor Street and east of Fourteenth Street, \$160,000; and the commissioners are hereby authorized to enter into a contract or contracts for said building at a cost not to exceed \$375,000.

For beginning the erection of a junior high school in the vicinity of the Gage, Emery, and Eckington Schools, \$160,000; and the commissioners are hereby authorized to enter into a contract or contracts for said building at a cost not to exceed \$375,000.

For beginning the erection of a 16-room building north of and in the vicinity of Lincoln Park, \$120,000; and the commissioners are hereby authorized to enter into a contract or contracts for said building at a cost not to exceed \$300,000.

For the erection of an 8-room extensible building adjoining the Buchanan School, \$150,000.

For the construction of an 8-room addition to the S. J. Bowen School, \$150,000.

For the erection of an 8-room extensible building in the immediate vicinity of the Mott School, \$150,000.

For the erection of an 8-room addition to the John Eaton School, \$150,000.

For the erection of a 4-room building to replace the Smothers School, \$75,000.

For the erection of an 8-room addition to the Lovejoy School, \$150,000.

For the erection of a 4-room addition to the Monroe School, \$75,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. HARRISON. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. POMERENE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS]. I do not know how he would vote on this question, and I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I would like to ask if the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If he were present, and I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I have a pair with that Senator, and withhold my vote.

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. KING. I have a pair on this question with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and withhold my vote.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. I transfer my pair to the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and vote "nay."

Mr. KNOX. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN]. I transfer my pair to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] and vote "nay."

Mr. McCUMBER. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] and vote "nay."

Mr. FALL. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. GLASS (after having voted in the negative). I am informed that the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN], if present, would vote as I have voted. I have a general pair with that Senator but will permit my vote to stand.

Mr. HARRISON (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]. If he were present he would vote as I did, and I shall let my vote stand.

Mr. CURTIS. The senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] is attending a meeting of the Committee on the Judiciary. He is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. If present and not paired the senior Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay."

I also desire to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE];

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHELDS]; and

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT].

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—20.

Dial	Johnson, S. Dak.	Owen	Stanley
Gerry	Kenyon	Reed	Trammell
Harrison	Kirby	Robinson	Underwood
Heflin	La Follette	Sheppard	Walsh, Mass.
Hitchcock	McKellar	Simmons	Wolcott

NAYS—45.

Ashurst	Gay	McCumber	Smith, Md.
Ball	Glass	McLean	Smoot
Beckham	Gooding	Moses	Spencer
Bracegirdle	Gronna	Myers	Sutherland
Calder	Hale	Nelson	Swanson
Capper	Harris	New	Townsend
Cole	Henderson	Overman	Wadsworth
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Page	Warren
Dillingham	Kellogg	Phelps	Willis
Edge	Keyes	Poinexter	
Fernald	Knox	Ransdell	
Frelinghuysen	McCormick	Smith, Ga.	

NOT VOTING—31.

Borah	Gore	Newberry	Smith, Ariz.
Chamberlain	Johnson, Calif.	Norris	Smith, S. C.
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Penrose	Sterling
Cummins	Kendrick	Phelan	Thomas
Elkins	King	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Fall	Lenroot	Pomerene	Watson
Fletcher	Lodge	Sherman	Williams
France	McNary	Shields	

So the Senate refused to recommit the bill with instructions. Mr. KING. I move that the bill now before the Senate, House bill 15130, be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions that they shall reduce the total amount not less than \$2,000,000.

I called attention this morning to the appropriations which have been made from time to time for the District. I called attention to the fact that the bill this year carries nearly \$5,000,000 more than it did in 1918, 1919, and 1920. I called attention to the fact that the Treasury is unable now to respond to the legitimate demands made upon it and that this is not the proper time to increase appropriations for the District. It seems to me that there can be no question in regard to what the action of the Senate should be upon the motion.

The motion was rejected.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate request a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments, and that the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed as conferees on the part of the Senate Mr. CURTIS, Mr. PHIPPS, and Mr. SMITH of Maryland.

FEDERAL CONTROL OF INDUSTRIES.

Mr. FERNALD. Mr. President, I wish to announce that on Friday next, immediately after the routine morning business, I shall desire to address the Senate on the Federal control of industries.

DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2379) to provide for the disposition of certain public lands withdrawn and improved under the provisions of the act of Congress approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. L., p. 847), as amended by the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. L., p. 497), and which are no longer needed, which were, on page 2, line 4, after the word "same," to insert "to a citizen of the United States," and on page 2, line 16, after the word "person," to insert "Provided further, That any patent issued hereunder shall contain a reservation to the United States of all oil, gas, coal, and other mineral."

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask my colleague the nature of the amendments made by the House and the purpose of the same, as well as the purpose of the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Wherever there is title to land of the description found in the bill, the House thinks we ought to reserve to the United States all oil and gas that may be discovered hereafter under those lands. I will say to my colleague that it is the usual amendment that is offered, and I do not know why we did not put it on in the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

PUBLIC LAND ENTRIES.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3994) validating certain applications for and entries of public lands, and for other purposes.

The amendments were, on page 2, after line 14, to insert:

Homestead entry, Sterling, Colo., No. 016335, made by Amelia P. Clark on August 14, 1911, under the act of February 19, 1909 (35 Stat. L., p. 639), for lots 6 and 7, and the east half of the southwest quarter and the southeast quarter of section 6, township 11 north, range 57 west, sixth principal meridian.

On page 2, after line 23, to insert:

Jennie Dunphy Meyer, for the following-described lands: The north half of the northeast quarter and the south half of the northwest quarter of section 10, township 33 north, range 47 east, Mount Diablo base and meridian, in the county of Lander, State of Nevada, upon the payment in advance therefor to the Secretary of the Interior for the Government of the United States of the full sum of \$2.50 per acre for such lands, which patent shall confirm the conveyance of such lands to the said Jennie Dunphy Meyer by the State of Nevada: *Provided*, That proper application for the purchase of these lands be filed hereunder in the district land office within six months from the passage of this act, and that no adverse claim thereto be officially of record as pending when the application is allowed and the sale consummated.

On page 4, after line 11, to insert:

Homestead entry, Buffalo, Wyo., No. 08829, made by Donald Thompson on October 18, 1916, for the west half of the southwest quarter, section 3, and north half of the northwest corner, section 10, township 53 north, range 79 west, sixth principal meridian.

On page 4, after line 11, to insert:

Homestead entry, Durango, Colo., No. 07648, made by Mary A. Reim on May 28, 1918, for the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter, east half of the southwest quarter, southwest quarter of the southwest quarter, section 13, and west half of the northwest quarter, section 24, township 36 north, range 15 west, New Mexico principal meridian: *Provided*, That it be duly noted that this entry is made in accordance with and subject to the provisions and reservations of the act of June 22, 1910 (36 Stat. L., p. 583), as to the east half of the southwest quarter and the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 13.

On page 4, after line 11, to insert:

Homestead entry, Glenwood Springs, Colo., No. 01497, made by Laderia N. Lucore on May 10, 1918, under the act of February 19, 1909 (35 Stat. L., p. 639), for lots 3 and 4, section 1, and lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, and south half of the northeast quarter, section 2, township 10 north, range 93 west, sixth principal meridian.

On page 4, after line 11, to insert:

Homestead entry 013785, Dodge City series, made by Gustavus F. Gallagher, for south half section 28, township 24 south, range 40 west, of the sixth principal meridian, Kansas.

On page 5, after line 7, to insert:

Homestead application of Ralph B. Quinn, of Phoenix, Ariz., for lots 1 and 2 and the south half of the northwest quarter, section 6, township 1 south, range 3 east, Gila and Salt River meridian, subject to the provisions of the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. L., p. 388), and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto: *Provided*, That said Quinn tender a proper application therefor within 90 days from receipt of notice of the passage of this act from the register and receiver of the United States Land Office: *Provided further*, That the entryman shall not be entitled to receive water for irrigation until public announcement by the Secretary of the Interior that water is available for the irrigation of the land.

On page 5, after line 7, to insert:

Additional homestead application, Rapid City series 039141, to Edward E. Voedisch, embracing the east half northwest quarter section 3 and north half northeast quarter section 10, township 6 south, range 1 east, Black Hills meridian, subject to the requirements of the enlarged homestead act as to residence, cultivation, and improvement: *Provided*, That patent shall not issue for said east half of the northwest quarter of section 3 until said tract shall have been duly surveyed by the Government.

On page 5, after line 7, to insert:

Homestead application 037866, Rapid City series, of William Holsten, for the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 15, township 2 north, range 5 east, Black Hills meridian, in the State of South Dakota.

On page 7, after line 22, to insert:

"SEC. 11. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, directed to change homestead entries Nos. 021565 and 021566, embracing all of section 27, township 35 north, range 80 west, sixth principal meridian, Douglas, Wyo., land district, made by Frank O. Kellman, on October 23, 1919, and November 11, 1919, respectively, and to transfer the payments made thereon to any other tract of 640 acres of land subject to entry under the act of December 29, 1916 (39 Stat. L., p. 862), and to issue patent thereon subject to the provisions and limitations of said act, without any showing of residence, cultivation, or improvement: *Provided*, That the said Kellman shall file application for said tract within 12 months from the date of the approval of this act."

On page 7, after line 22, to insert:

"SEC. 12. That the location No. 20, township 6 north, range 9 west, second principal meridian, Indiana, which has been surveyed in the name of Thomas Johnston, as appears from the field notes of survey on file in the General Land Office, be, and the same is hereby, confirmed to the said Thomas Johnston, and the Commissioner of the General Land Office shall issue his certificate as register ex officio and cause a patent to be issued for said claim to Thomas Johnston, his heirs, assigns, and legal representatives: *Provided*, That this act and the patent which may be granted in pursuance of the same shall only operate as a relinquishment on the part of the United States, and shall in no way prejudice any valid adverse right, if such exist, to the said land, the intent being that title shall issue to the true owners of the land under the laws of Indiana, including laws of limitation and prescription, as though patent had issued during the lifetime of said Thomas Johnston."

On page 7, after line 22, to insert:

"SEC. 13. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to issue a patent to R. L. Douglass, of Fallon, Nev., for a certain tract of land now a part of the public domain, lying below the Carson Lake meander in the unsurveyed portion of section 19, township 17 north, range 29 east, Mount Diablo meridian, in the State of Nevada, more fully described as follows: Beginning at the meander corner south

of section corner common to sections 12 and 13, township 17 north, range 28 east, and sections 18 and 19, township 17 north, range 29 east, Mount Diablo meridian; thence south 9.6 chains; thence north 89 degrees 21 minutes east 21.9 chains; thence north 21.56 chains; thence north 73 degrees 30 minutes west .81 chain along Carson Lake meander; thence south 61 degrees 30 minutes west 24 chains to the point of beginning, containing 33.74 acres, more or less, on the express condition, however, that said R. L. Douglass shall first execute and deliver to the Secretary of the Interior a warranty deed satisfactory to such Secretary conveying to the Government of the United States, free of all encumbrance, a certain tract of land composed of portions of lots 2, 3, and 4 of section 19, township 17 north, range 29 east, Mount Diablo meridian, in the State of Nevada, more fully described as follows: Beginning at the meander corner of the section line common to sections 18 and 19, township 17 north, range 29 east, Mount Diablo meridian, running thence along the north boundary of section 19, south 89 degrees 21 minutes west 53.82 chains; thence south 1.34 chains to a point in the meander line of Carson Lake; thence south 73 degrees 30 minutes east 36.69 chains along Carson Lake meander; thence north 56 degrees 30 minutes east 22.40 chains to the point of beginning, containing 33.74 acres, more or less, which shall thereupon become a part of the public domain.

"That as a consideration for the issue of said patent, R. L. Douglass will construct a substantial fence around the tract of land conveyed to him under the provisions of this act."

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments made by the House.

The motion was agreed to.

MILK RIVER VALLEY GUN CLUB.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 793) authorizing the issuance of patent to the Milk River Valley Gun Club, which were, on page 1, line 9, after the word "acres," to insert "to be used for a game preserve"; on page 1, line 12, to strike out the word "the" and insert "for such"; on page 1, lines 12 and 13, to strike out the words "being fixed at 30 acres to be used for a game preserve" and insert "as may be determined by the said Secretary"; and on page 1, line 15, to strike out the words "six months from the date of approval of this act" and insert "one year from the passage of this act."

Mr. POINDEXTER. May I inquire where the land is situated that is referred to in the bill?

Mr. MYERS. I move that the House amendments be concurred in by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington desires some information.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Where is the land located?

Mr. MYERS. It is in the State of Montana. The House amendments are not particularly material and are perfectly acceptable. I move that they be concurred in.

The motion was agreed to.

EMERGENCY TARIFF.

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15275) imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products to meet present emergencies, to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

Mr. SIMMONS. Before action is taken on the motion of the Senator from Utah, I desire to ask whether it is his purpose to take up the bill at once for consideration?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that it is not. Unless some one wishes to discuss it at this time, I shall ask that it may be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. SIMMONS. May I ask the Senator, further, if he is in a position to state when it is expected to take up the bill for consideration?

Mr. SMOOT. If the notices that are already given are to be followed out, there will be speeches to-morrow that will take up the whole day.

Mr. SIMMONS. Could we not, then, have an understanding that the bill will not be taken up until some subsequent day? I wish to say to the Senator that in conference with the chairman of the Committee on Finance I was led to believe that the bill would probably not be taken up until toward the close of the week.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I expect to occupy some time upon what is known as the packers' bill. I know that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] desires to speak three or four hours upon that bill, if not longer. I know that the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] expects to speak at least an hour and a half on Friday upon the Federal control of industries. I feel safe in saying to the Senator that there will not be much done with the bill until toward the close of the week.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then, I understand the Senator will lay aside temporarily the emergency tariff bill for the consideration of the packers' bill?

Mr. SMOOT. The speeches that are to be made will be made upon that bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator does not expect to take up the emergency tariff bill for consideration by the Senate until toward the close of the week?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not see how we can do so before that time.

Mr. KING. I wish to inquire of my colleague whether the testimony taken before the Committee on Finance is available to Senators now?

Mr. SMOOT. I think it is available. If the Senator will ask the clerk of the Committee on Finance, he can no doubt procure copies of it.

Mr. KING. I think Senators desire to have access to the testimony and an opportunity to read it before the bill shall be taken up for consideration.

Mr. SMOOT. I am sure if the Senator will inquire of the clerk of the committee he can secure a copy of the testimony.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will not the Senator withhold his motion until to-morrow? The reason why I make the request is because several days ago the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] stated that he was going to call up the motion to reconsider what is known as the Poindexter anti-strike bill, immediately following the disposition of the District of Columbia appropriation bill. The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], who is not now in the Senate Chamber, is very anxious to get before the Senate the minimum wage bill. He served notice on the Senate some days ago that immediately after we had finished the District of Columbia appropriation bill he would call up the minimum wage bill.

These are two bills which we have had notice served upon us would be called up, and we are now taking action when the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is not on the floor and the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is not here either, and they possibly do not know that the matter is now before the Senate, because I think they are busy here at a meeting of the Committee on Manufactures on a very important proposition. I see that the Senator from California has just entered the Chamber.

Then, too, I may say that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] has charge of a bill which in my opinion is one of the most important bills that the Senate can consider, and it should be passed at an early date. It is a bill that deals with disabled soldiers, providing hospitals for them. The Senator from Maryland served notice on the Senate only two or three days ago that immediately after we finished the District of Columbia appropriation bill he would try to make that bill the unfinished business. He is vitally interested in it. It is a matter on which the Senate ought to take immediate action and get through with it.

So I suggest to the Senator that he put off his motion until to-morrow, when the various Senators interested in these measures can be here, and then, if they consent to the course proposed, it is all right.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that as far as the hospitals for disabled soldiers are concerned, that question will be taken up by the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and I have not any doubt but that the program which has been mapped out by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service will be put into an appropriation bill. I do not know whether the Senator was in the Chamber at the time I made that statement to the Senator from Maryland, and it was perfectly satisfactory to him.

Mr. HARRISON. I did not hear that statement.

Mr. SMOOT. All that the Senator from Maryland desires is to have an appropriation made for that purpose. The Surgeon General says it will take three years to carry out the program, and he asks for an appropriation of \$30,000,000 for that purpose. He desires an appropriation for this year of \$10,000,000, and I have not any doubt, I will say to the Senator, that that will be the program to be carried out.

Mr. HARRISON. I am very much in favor of the bill for the relief of disabled soldiers. I notice that it was reported out of the committee on June 2, 1920, and it has been on the calendar ever since. The bill ought to be considered, it would seem to me, and in fairness to the Senator from Maryland I think it would be best to consider and pass that measure. I did not hear the discussion in the Senate to which the Senator has called my attention.

Mr. SMOOT. As I have already stated, there is no desire on the part of any member of the Finance Committee to force the bill to consideration immediately. The morning hour will be open to the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] at any time, or if he desires to call up his bill this afternoon I would be perfectly willing, as far as I am concerned, to lay the emergency tariff bill aside temporarily for that purpose.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator from California gave notice several days ago that he was going to call it up immediately after we had finished the District of Columbia appropriation bill. So I call his attention to it now, because the Senator was absent at the time the matter came up, being in attendance upon a meeting of the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I have no desire, of course, to interfere with any business that may be considered of extraordinary importance in the Senate, but here is a bill that I think in a very brief period may be disposed of. I ask the Senator from Utah if he will not permit it to come up and an endeavor made to dispose of it, which, I think, can be accomplished before adjournment time this evening. I may be in error as to that, however.

Mr. SMOOT. So far as I am concerned, I will ask that the emergency tariff bill be immediately laid aside temporarily, and then the Senator can call up his bill, if the Senate desires to do so, just as soon as the emergency tariff bill is made the unfinished business. I do not know of any speeches to be made upon it to-day, unless some one desires to speak that I do not know about.

Mr. HARRISON. Would the Senator object to allowing the minimum wage bill to be made the unfinished business, and let that be laid aside temporarily?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I would object to that. I desire to have the emergency tariff bill made the unfinished business, and then I shall ask to have it laid aside temporarily, if the Senate desires it to be laid aside.

Mr. HARRISON. The minimum wage bill has been on the calendar for six or eight months, I think, at least for a very long time, and it would seem to me that it ought to be made the unfinished business. It can then be laid aside temporarily and we can take up the tariff bill.

Mr. SMOOT. The same can be said of every bill on the calendar. The Senator knows that they can not all be passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Do I understand the Senator from Utah to say that if the emergency tariff bill is made the unfinished business he has no objection to having it laid aside temporarily?

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection to having it laid aside.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. And then take up the minimum-wage bill?

Mr. SMOOT. To take up any bill the Senate desires to take up.

Mr. KING. The Senator from California is aware of the fact that the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] is detained from the Senate for a day or two on account of the very serious illness of his wife. The Senator from Colorado made the motion to reconsider, and I ask, as a favor to the Senator from Colorado, that the Senator from California defer his request until to-morrow in order that I may get in touch with the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. If I could have the bill taken up to-morrow I should be perfectly willing to defer my request. All I wish to do is to have the bill taken up.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from California may have the bill taken up to-morrow morning for aught I know to the contrary.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. But let me say to the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] that when the Senator from Colorado was interrogated by me about a month ago as to his attitude he then said—I do not quote him exactly but substantially—that he had said all he desired upon the subject of the bill. I may say further to the Senator from Utah that the bill comes to us not upon reconsideration now, because reconsideration was accorded upon the representation that certain Senators were not present when the bill was passed. So the bill is here in its entirety. I think the Senator will recall—I speak only from the Record, because I was not present—that the bill was not passed at the last session, or, rather, a final vote was not taken upon it, because the session expired substantially during the debate upon the bill.

Mr. KING. I do not recall just exactly the various stages of the bill. I am only asking that the Senator from California will let the bill go over until to-morrow. I will in the meantime get in touch with the Senator from Colorado and shall have no objection to taking the bill up to-morrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I shall be very glad if I can have the bill taken up to-morrow; but what I want to do is to have the bill taken up and disposed of. If the Senate in its wisdom does not see fit to pass the bill, then I want it defeated, and if the Senate thinks it ought to be passed, as I believe, then I want it passed.

Mr. KING. I shall join with the Senator from California to-morrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is that satisfactory to the senior Senator from Utah?

Mr. SMOOT. It is perfectly satisfactory to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. May I not in some fashion, so that there will be no misunderstanding to-morrow, have unanimous consent that the bill will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think the Senator from California could have unanimous consent to take up a bill that is not before the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Then let us put the bill before the Senate, and have unanimous consent now for its consideration to-morrow.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the bill for which I have asked consideration be made the unfinished business, and then I shall consent that it be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. To-night, so that the bill for which I asked consideration may come up to-morrow?

Mr. SMOOT. So that it may come up at once, if that is desired.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Very well; that is all right.

Mr. SMOOT obtained the floor.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON. On behalf of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], I desire to submit an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the emergency tariff bill. I ask that the proposed amendment may be printed and be considered pending.

Mr. SMOOT. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the proposed amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

The question is on the motion of the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] to proceed to the consideration of the bill, the title of which will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 15275) imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products to meet present emergencies, to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments.

Mr. SMOOT. Now I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

COMPENSATION OF UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The unfinished business having been laid aside, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 5726, the so-called minimum wage bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I would rather have the Senator ask unanimous consent to proceed to the consideration of the minimum wage bill, without a direct vote of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Very well. I ask unanimous consent that the minimum wage bill be taken up for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California asks unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 5726. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I should like to know whether the Senator intends to attempt to get a vote on the bill this evening?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No; that is not my intention.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then I will suggest to the Senator that taking the bill up this evening will not accomplish anything, because, another measure being the unfinished business, to-morrow morning he would have to move to take the bill up in any event.

Mr. SMOOT. If we recess, that would not be necessary.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I did not know it was contemplated to take a recess.

Mr. SMOOT. It was the understanding that we should take a recess.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I will say to the Senator from Alabama that a suggestion was made that unanimous consent be accorded to take up the measure, and then that we recess until to-morrow, at which time the bill in which I am interested may be taken up.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of course, then it would be in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I hope the Senator from Alabama will not object to that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the Senator that, so far as I am concerned, I am not for the bill and expect to vote against it, but I have no desire to object and do not intend to object to its consideration. The only thought I was suggesting was that I understood we were going to adjourn, and if we

should adjourn, I thought the motion would not accomplish anything.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I renew my request for unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the so-called minimum wage bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

Mr. POINDEXTER. What is the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is for unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 5726, being what is known as the minimum wage bill.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will ask the Senator from California what is the program in the event that is done?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. To take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow, when the bill will be taken up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5726) to fix the compensation of certain employees of the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on Education and Labor with amendments.

ADJUSTMENT AND LIQUIDATION OF MINERAL CLAIMS.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I ask leave, out of order, to submit a resolution, which I ask may be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the resolution submitted by the Senator from Arkansas will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 429) was read, as follows:

Be it resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish the Senate the following information, if available:

1. A complete list of all claims filed or presented under section 5 of the act of Congress entitled "An act to provide relief in cases of contracts connected with the prosecution of the war, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1919, including the names of claimants and amounts of their claims and when filed.

2. A list of all claims allowed under said act, including the names of claimants whose claims have been allowed and the amounts of the respective claims allowed.

3. A list of all claims presented and disallowed, together with the names of the claimants and the amounts of said claims and the reasons for the disallowance of each.

4. Information as to all legal constructions placed upon said act by the Secretary of the Interior, or by the Attorney General, together with copies of formal opinions rendered, if any, involving the construction of said act.

Mr. ROBINSON. I should like to have present consideration of the resolution, if there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which has just been read. Is there objection?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas explain the resolution, or else permit the Secretary again to read it?

Mr. ROBINSON. I can state the object of the resolution in just a moment.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I may not want to object to the adoption of the resolution, but I should like to hear the explanation of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, the resolution calls for information from the Secretary of the Interior as to what proceedings have been had under an act passed by Congress authorizing him to adjust and liquidate certain claims asserted by citizens who were alleged to have been induced by the Government or by some of its departments to engage in the business of mining manganese, chrome, pyrites, or tungsten in order to meet the requirements of the Government in the conduct of the war. A large number of these claims have been filed, and a construction has been placed upon the statute, as I have heard, that is very important and that has had the effect of denying most of the claims that have been presented.

I desire to bring to the Senate the information regarding the matter which is in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior, together with the opinion of the Attorney General which has been rendered upon the subject, so that if the Senate desires to do so it may hereafter take further action regarding the matter. The resolution merely calls for information.

Mr. GRONNA. I have no objection to the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution is agreed to.

INTERFERENCE WITH COMMERCE.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I should like to make a request for unanimous consent in connection with the matter which I gave notice I would call up at this time. I refer to Senate bill 4204. There is a motion for reconsideration pending. I ask unani-

mous consent that the motion for reconsideration be granted and that the bill remain upon the calendar in the status in which it formally was.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GRONNA. I shall have to object to that.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. LODGE presented a memorial of the Union Park Street Temple, of Brookline, Mass., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation restricting the immigration of aliens, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Massachusetts Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, of Boston, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation restricting the immigration of aliens, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. McLEAN presented a memorial of the Hearthstone Club, of Hartford, Conn., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation commercializing the national parks, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented petitions of J. Edmund Miller, president Federation of Federal Employees, of Hartford, Conn.; William R. Pollock, president Local No. 162, Federal Employees, of New London, Conn.; George G. Hummel, of Naugatuck, Conn.; Edward J. Hummel, of Naugatuck, Conn.; and Henry Merhoff, of Naugatuck, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation continuing the \$240 bonus to Federal employees for the next fiscal year, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Bridgeport, Conn., protesting against present conditions in the occupied zone of the Rhine in respect to the presence and action of French colonial troops, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. PHIPPS presented a resolution of La Veta Post, No. 32, Grand Army of the Republic, of Walsenburg, Colo., opposing any further increase of pensions for the soldiers of the Civil War until the condition of the country's finances will warrant such an increase, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CAPPER presented a resolution adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation at its recent annual meeting held in the city of Indianapolis, Ind., favoring the truth in fabric bill, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS.

Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 2682) for the relief of Blanche Winters, reported it favorably without amendment and submitted a report (No. 701) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SWANSON:

A bill (S. 4885) granting an increase of pension to Rose B. Isaac; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 4886) to extend the time of the Hudson River Connecting Railroad Corporation for the completion of its bridge across the Hudson River, in the State of New York; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. TRAMMELL:

A bill (S. 4887) to designate Tampa, Fla., as a port at which a marine school may be established and maintained under the act of Congress approved March 4, 1911; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

AMENDMENT TO SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$250,000 for purchasing a site for and constructing and equipping a lighthouse depot for the seventh lighthouse district, and also \$17,500 for establishing and improving aids to navigation in Tampa Bay, Fla., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

RECESS.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, January 20, 1921, at 12 o'clock meridian.